Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

RQ40
F11

234.9
234.9
RQ40
F11

10

Jan. 1861.

The Author combines clearness and candour with a sound judgment and christian spirit throughout.

C.H.S. March 6th 1861

P. J. LIBRARY
K. C. K.
BAPTIST SEMINARY

THE

PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE

OF

ELECTION;

OR

AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY

INTO THE

IDEALITY AND CAUSATION OF SCRIPTURAL ELECTION,

AS RECEIVED AND MAINTAINED IN

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

BY GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B. D.

MASTER OF SHERBURN HOSPITAL AND PREBENDARY OF SALISBURY.

AUTHOR OF "DIFFICULTIES ROMANISM," "DIFFICULTIES OF INFIDELITY," ETC.

Id esse dominicum et verum, quod sit prius traditum: id autem extraneum et falsum, quod sit posterius immissum. Tertull. de Præscript. adv. Hær. § 11. Oper. p. 107.

FIRST AMERICAN EDITION.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY CHARLES HENRY,

No. 124 Fulton Street.

1840.

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

PRINTED BY J. P. WRIGHT,
19 New street, N. Y.

234.9
F1.5

TO THE MEMORY OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

WILLIAM VAN MILDERT, S. T. P.,

LATE LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM:

A MAN, WHOM TO KNOW WAS TO LOVE;

A DIVINE, WHOM TO CONVERSE WITH WAS TO BE INSTRUCTED;

A PRELATE, WHOM TO CONSULT WAS TO BE PRIVILEGED:

THIS WORK,

A LAST TOKEN OF GRATEFUL VENERATION,

MOURNFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY, IS INSCRIBED AND DEDICATED,

BY ITS AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

THE reading with an eye to any one particular subject can rarely be conducted, without its incidentally throwing a light upon other subjects also. This, at least in Theology, has certainly happened to be my own experience.

I. During a term of several years, circumstances, which it is needless to specify, led me to peruse pretty extensively the Works of the early Antenicene Fathers, with the object of ascertaining, through the medium of my own eye-sight: *Whether the doctrine of the Trinity and the allied doctrine of Christ's Essential Godhead could be clearly traced, as the received and inculcated doctrines of the Catholic Church, up to the very age of the Apostles.* For it struck me: that those doctrines, if exhibiting the *real* mind of Scripture, *must* have been held by Catholic Christians from the very beginning; and, conversely, that those doctrines, if *not* held by Catholic Christians from the very beginning, *could not* be reasonably viewed as exhibiting the *real* mind of Scripture.

II. My reading for this purpose incidentally made me better qualified, than I should otherwise have been, for an historical examination of the *Doctrinal Claims of Po-*

pery: and, when, by a respectable Anglican Laic, I was called upon to perform that task with a special reference to the garbled plausibilities of the Bishop of Strasburg, I felt the less inclination to a refusal, because it had been impossible for me not to observe; that the peculiarities of the Romish Church were mere comparatively modern innovations, and that they could not only not be traced up to the apostolic age and the apostolic sanction, but that in numerous instances they were even directly contradicted by the ancient documents of the Church Catholic.

III. The examination, here specified, led to the production of two Works, severally entitled *The Difficulties of Romanism* and *The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism.*

1. Yet, while an examination of the early Fathers, for the purpose of tracing the doctrines of Christ's Godhead and the Holy Trinity up to the time and authority of the Apostles, thus led me to perceive the utter futility of the claims of Popery: the same examination could not fail also to shew me the insecure foundation, so far as historical testimony is concerned, upon which the three most commonly received Systems of interpreting the language of Scripture, respecting the doctrine of *Election*, have been by their several votaries constructed.

(1.) As I advanced in my researches, though for quite a different purpose, I was struck with perceiving: that, in the early writings of the Church, neither *Calvinism* nor *Arminianism* nor *Nationalism* (if, for want of a better name, I may so designate the System of Mr. Locke) could, as Systems combining severally a well-defined

Scheme of CAUSATION with a well-defined Scheme of IDEALITY, be any where discovered.

We find, indeed, the Scheme of CAUSATION, which is common alike to *Calvinism* and to *Nationalism*, occurring in the oldest ecclesiastical documents that have come down to us: and we also find the Scheme of CAUSATION, which specially characterises *Arminianism*, prominent in various writings subsequent to the time of Clement of Alexandria, with whom that Scheme appears to have originated.

But, for the Scheme of IDEALITY which is common alike to *Calvinism* and to *Arminianism*, and for the Scheme of IDEALITY which is peculiar to *Nationalism*, we shall vainly search the records of proper Antiquity: they were equally unknown to that Church, which, either in a more or in a less restricted sense, may justly be denominated *Primitive*.

Hence, I believe, it may be truly said: that, *as* Systems, the three Systems in question were altogether unknown to the Ancients.

(2.) Such, in brief, is the *negative* evidence afforded by Ecclesiastical History.

But this *negative* evidence by no means constitutes the *whole* amount of the testimony which has descended to us.

Positive evidence, as equally preserved by Ecclesiastical History, is even still more, than *negative* evidence, decidedly adverse to each of the three Systems of Locke and of Calvin and of Arminius.

While, in the course of my researches, I was struck with perceiving *negatively*, that, in the early writings of the Church, not a vestige of those three Systems, *as* Systems,

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K. BAPTIST SEMINARY

could be discovered: I was also struck with perceiving *positively*, that yet a fourth System, essentially different from all the three, in point either of IDEALITY or of CAUSATION or of both IDEALITY and CAUSATION, was, by the earliest Church Catholic, received and delivered, as exhibiting the true sense and manner in which the scriptural terms *Elect* and *Predestinate* or *Election* and *Predestination* ought to be explained and understood.

2. A statement of this description, of course, implies the comparative modernness, and therefore real novelty, of any System, except that, which, on competent evidence, can legitimately claim to be primeval.

Hence, in reference to such modernness and such novelty, I may perhaps be permitted to subjoin a few remarks on the chronological origination of the three Systems at present before us.

(1.) At what precise time, the System, now denominated *Arminianism*, commenced, I am unable to say. It was received among the schoolmen, anterior to the age of the Reformation: but, in point both of IDEALITY and of CAUSATION, it was utterly unknown to the strictly earliest Church or the Church down to about the end of the second century.

(2.) As little am I able to specify the commencement of the System which I have distinguished by the appellation of *Nationalism*, if Locke were not its original author. Some specious passages in its favour, by which I mean *in favour of its* IDEALITY, may doubtless be produced from the writings of the ancient Fathers, though Locke does not pro-

fess to avail himself of their evidence: but, when these passages are carefully examined, they will prove to give no support to the System in question.

(3.) *Calvinism*, on the contrary, as that System is now usually termed, has its commencement marked with an uncommon degree of precision.

Wishing fairly to come to the bottom of the matter, and well aware that Augustine had taught the System long before the days of the celebrated Calvin, I employed my first season of leisure in carefully perusing the whole Pelagian Controversy of that eminent Father: during the course of which, and specially toward the conclusion of which, he is known to have copiously stated and to have vigourously maintained the System now under consideration.

The result was precisely what I had anticipated from my previous reading of the *earlier* Fathers.

When Augustine fully propounded his own views of *Election* and *Predestination*, he was immediately charged with innovating upon the ancient doctrine of the Church, he was assured by the complainants that they had never before heard of such speculations, he was referred to the current System of the existing Catholic Church, and he was challenged to produce evidence that his new opinions had ever been advanced as the mind of Scripture by any of his ecclesiastical predecessors.

Nor was the matter thus taken up merely by the Pelagian adversaries of Augustine: though, even if it *had*, since it purely related to a question of FACT, small was the *real* consequence by *whom* it was taken up. The charge of un-

authorised innovation was respectfully brought by persons, who concurred with Augustine in his opposition to Pelagianism, and whose doctrine in regard to *Original Sin* and *Human Insufficiency* and *Divine Grace* he himself acknowledged to be sound and correct.

Such, then, was the charge: and, as the charge rested upon the allegation of a FACT, it clearly could not be set aside save by the process of shewing the allegation of the FACT to be altogether *false* and *unfounded.*

Of this, Augustine was conscious: and, being driven to a reply, out of the whole mass of earlier ecclesiastical writers he ventured only even to *attempt* to produce three. These were Cyprian and Gregory-Nazianzen and Ambrose: all, far too modern, even if they had been to his purpose; but all, either useless, or worse than useless, to him, in the way of evidence, even comparatively modern as they were. As for Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, (adduced, as they have recently been by Mr. Milner, in the capacity of witnesses,) he does not appear so much as for a moment to have imagined, that *they* could in any wise be made useful to him in the way of testimony. Most important as *they* doubtless would have been in the character of witnesses, could they have been cogently and availably brought forward: Augustine passes *them* over, in total, though perfectly intelligible, silence.

The charge, therefore, we may pronounce to be fully established.

In point of FACT, the System, now denominated *Calvinism*, was unheard of, until, at the beginning of the fifth

century, it was first promulgated and defended by Augustine.

Consequently, still in point of FACT, the mere unauthoritative private judgment of a single individual, who was flourishing at the commencement of the fifth century, is the *sole* ultimate basis upon which the System reposes.

3. What I have thus stated are mere HISTORICAL FACTS, negative or positive.

Negatively, the earliest Church knew nothing, systematically, either of Arminianism, or of Calvinism, or of Nationalism.

Positively, the earliest Church recognised a System essentially, in point of IDEALITY, different from all three: and this fourth System, by the very act of her recognition, she viewed as exhibiting the true sense of Holy Writ.

But, while these FACTS, *as* FACTS, must in themselves forever remain unaltered and unalterable, totally independent upon any Systems which man's private judgment may excogitate: still, in the way of a necessary result from established principles, we cannot avoid feeling that they draw after them very important consequences.

In its application to the case of a Divine Revelation, the canon of Tertullian propounds an eternal and necessary verity.

*Whatever is first, is true: whatever is later, is adulterate.**

For, according to the explanation of his canon, as given by Tertullian himself: *That, which has been first delivered*

* Id esse verum, quodcunque primum: id esse adulterum, quodcunque posterius. Tertull. adv. Prax. § 2. Oper. p. 405.

*or revealed to mankind, must be received as true and as proceeding from the Lord: while that, which has been introduced at a later period, must inevitably, as such, be deemed false and extraneous.**

In the matter of a Divine Revelation, it cannot be otherwise. Any *new* doctrine, unknown through the *first* communication from heaven, and introduced by some expositorial speculatist *subsequent* to the day of that first communication, cannot possibly rest upon authority higher than that of mere human uninspired authority. It has, as Tertullian speaks, been *immitted*, or *let in*, or *introduced* at a later period: while yet it has been altogether unknown to those who first received the very Revelation out of which it now at length purports to have been extracted. Clearly, therefore, it can be neither part nor parcel of the Divine Revelation itself: because, if it had, it *must* have been familiarly known and universally received from the beginning. Hence, obviously, on sound principles of evidence, unless we be magnanimously resolved to dogmatise against all evidence, we stand compelled to reject the three several Systems of *Arminianism* and *Calvinism* and *Nationalism;* inasmuch as they were respectively unknown from the beginning, and inasmuch as they were respectively the mere later inventions of unauthorised theological speculatists.

Three Systems being thus disposed of, there remains only a fourth for our consideration: I mean that which

* Id esse dominicum et verum, quod sit prius traditum: id autem extraneum et falsum, quod sit posterius immissum. Tertull. de Præscription. advers. hæretic. § 11. Oper. p. 107.

History testifies to have been adopted by the Catholic Church, in point both of IDEALITY and of CAUSATION, from the time of the Apostles down to the time of Clement of Alexandria at the end of the second century.

Now, respecting this, on the same sound principles of evidence, little, I think, needs to be said. If we receive Christianity as a Divine Revelation, I see not how, consistently at least, we can reject that most ancient System which synchronises with the authoritative delivery of the acknowledged Divine Revelation itself.

IV. I may, in conclusion, add yet a further matter, which deserves the attentive notice both of those sound Protestants who reject the fables of Popery, and of those sound Trinitarians who reject the impieties of Socinianism, severally on the rational score, that *Such fables and such impieties were unknown to, and unrecognised by, the Primitive Church Catholic.*

All who take *this* line of argument, must honestly carry it *throughout*, or else *altogether relinquish* it as inefficient and unsatisfactory: for, on no just principle, can a man be allowed to pick and choose according to his own arbitrary humour.

1. The Calvinist, for instance, who *thus*, that is to say, *from primitive antiquity*, argues against Popery, while yet he himself, regardless of primitive antiquity, retains his Calvinism, *must*, from any acute and well-informed Papist, expect the speedy retort courteous.

If *you*, replies the Papist, object to *my* peculiarities, BECAUSE they are invisible and (as *you* say) sometimes even

contradicted in the ancient documents of the Church Catholic: what, on *your own* principle of reasoning, becomes of *your own* Calvinism; inasmuch as it was unknown and unheard of before the time of Augustine?

2. In like manner, the Arminian, who *thus* argues against the impieties of Socinianism, must be even content to hear the same retort from the modern Humanitarian who renounces the doctrine of the Trinity.

If the Primitive Church, replies the Socinian, knew nothing of *my* doctrine; and if *that* be a solid reason for rejecting it: truly the Primitive Church knew just as little of *your* System of Election; and, therefore, *that* System must be rejected also.

3. But, on the contrary, let us take the solid ground of Antiquity, as directed by the admirable canon of Tertullian: and we shall have taken a ground, rendered impregnable by the inevitable deduction from historical testimony. I say *inevitable*, not because some wrong-headed individuals *may* not refuse to draw such a deduction, but because, according to the dictates of right reason, such a deduction *cannot but* be drawn from such premises.

Hence the general result will be: that *The System of Election, received and taught by the earliest Church of the two first centuries, cannot fail to set forth the real sense of Divine Revelation.*

V. To prevent any misapprehension as to the nature and object of the present Work, it may be proper, once for all, to state: that, agreeably to its title, I wish it to be considered, not as *controversial* according to the usual import

of the term *controversial*, but altogether as *historically inquisitorial.*

Doctrinal Accuracy is, at all times and in all cases, desirable: and, even on points which are so far open that they involve not, either by their admission or by their rejection, our eternal welfare, it is better to theologise correctly, than to theologise incorrectly.

With a sole view, then, to *Doctrinal Accuracy*, and not for the purpose of what is called *writing against* any particular class of opinions, I have instituted this Inquiry (and I would have it deemed *only* an Inquiry) into the sentiments of the Primitive Church, and, through the medium of those sentiments, into the real mind of the holy revealed word of God.

Yet, in prosecuting such an Inquiry, it is obvious that the Truth could not be ascertained without a collateral exhibition and rejection of Error.

Nevertheless, since my researches lead me to esteem both *Arminianism* and *Nationalism* and *Calvinism*, as alike, though in different degrees, erroneous; because they have alike, though in different degrees, departed from the apostolic judgment of the earliest Christian Antiquity: I may perhaps, if I can claim nothing else, at least hope fairly to claim the praise of rigid and honest impartiality.

Sherburn-House,
Dec. 6, 1834.

BOOK I.

THE NEGATIVE TESTIMONY OF HISTORY IN REGARD TO THE TRUE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND PREDESTINATION.

Sicut Apostoli inter se diversa non docuerunt, ita et Apostolici non contraria Apostolis ediderunt. Quinimo impium esset, asseverare Apostolos viva voce contraria scriptis suis tradidisse. Paulus disertè dicit, eadem se in omnibus Ecclesiis docuisse. Confess. Helvet. sect. ii. in Syllog. Confess. p. 19.

THE

PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

That some *Doctrine of Election is taught in Holy Scripture*, can be doubted, I think, by no one, who, with even moderate attention, peruses the sacred volume.

But, as to what *Doctrine of Election is inculcated in Holy Scripture*, much diversity of opinion may easily prevail: for *this* matter can, in no wise, be deemed a point equally evident.

Accordingly, while the bare fact of *The scriptural inculcation of* some *Predestinarian Doctrine* has never been denied: great difference of sentiment has subsisted, and indeed still subsists, in regard to the important question of what *Predestinarian Doctrine ought to be received as the mind of Divine Revelation.*

I. Three several Schemes of Exposition have been advanced and maintained, as respectively setting forth what ought to be esteemed the genuineness of Scriptural Verity.

1. By the Remonstrants or Arminians, the idea of Election is pronounced to be *The Election of certain individuals, out of the great mass of mankind, directly and immediately, to eternal life:* and its moving cause is asserted to be *God's eternal Prevision of the future persevering holiness and*

consequent moral fitness of the individuals themselves, who thence have been thus elected.

2. By the Nationalists (if, for the convenience of brief nomenclature, I may employ the term,) the IDEA of Election is determined to be *The Election of certain whole nations into the pale of the visible Church Catholic, which Election, however, relates purely to their privileged condition in this world, extending not to their collective eternal state in another world:* and its MOVING CAUSE is pronounced to be *That same absolute Good Pleasure of God, which, through the exercise of his sovereign power, led him to choose the posterity of Jacob, rather than the posterity of Esau, that upon earth they should become his peculiar people and be made the depositories and preservers of the true religion.*

3. By the Calvinists or Austinists, the IDEA of Election is judged to be *The Election of certain individuals, out of the great mass of mankind, directly and immediately, to eternal life, while all other individuals are either passively left or actively doomed to a certainty of eternal death:* and its MOVING CAUSE is defined to be *God's unconditional and irrespective Will and Pleasure, inherent in, and exercised in consequence of, his absolute and uncontroulable Sovereignty.*

II. It is quite evident, that, even if scriptural truth is to be found correctly stated in some *one* of these several Schemes, *two*, out of the *three*, must inevitably be erroneous.

Yet the defenders of each Scheme are usually just as positive in maintaining the clear Scripturality of their respective favourites, as if no reasonable doubt could be severally entertained of the strict accuracy of those Schemes.

If we ask the ground of this positiveness, the text of Holy Writ, with an accompanying commentary, and often with an accompanying avowal likewise of a resolution to abide solely by the decision of Scripture, is usually produced in

reply: and each jarring speculatist marvels at the blindness, which either can not or will not read the Bible through the glasses employed and recommended by the speculatist himself.

Now such an answer, whatever appeals may *professedly* be made to the Bible and to the Bible alone, virtually admits: that, *In the case of each Scheme alike, the whole question is really a question of* INTERPRETATION.

Admit the interpretation of Arminius to be correct; and then, no doubt, you must embrace, as genuine biblical truth, the Scheme of Arminianism.

Admit the interpretation of Locke to be correct: and then, evidently, as exhibiting the real mind of Scripture, you stand pledged to the Scheme of Nationalism.

Admit the interpretation of Calvin to be correct: and then, indisputably, as setting forth the very essence of divine revelation, you are bound to advocate the Scheme of Calvinism.

But where is the PROOF, that the interpretation, which brings out any one of these three Systems, *is* correct?

If, in every case, the PROOF of scriptural correctness must finally be resolved into the mere self-satisfied Private Judgment of each conflicting religionist: such a collection of mutually warring PROOFS, like the negative and positive quantities in Algebra, will but serve mutually to destroy one another.

Or, if one of the speculatists should maintain that *his* Private Judgment is worthy of all acceptation, while the Private Judgment of each of his *opponents* severally furnishes but a lamentable specimen of embodied weakness: as, of course, he will lie open to, so, indisputably, he will receive, the speedy retort courteous.

In short, on any such plan of settling the matter by the

authoritative dogmatism of an individual's Private Judgment, the dispute must obviously be endless: and the general determination of an Article of Faith must, no less obviously, be impossible.

When each dogmatist alike assures us, that *his* interpretation MUST be correct; and when he assigns as a reason, that he himself, the dogmatist to wit, in the independent exercise of his naked Private Judgment, is quite satisfied of its correctness: we may be allowed, with all due impartiatliy, to hope, that the interpretation may be better than the logic.

III. Before, then, we receive *any one* of these three interpretations; if, indeed, by force of some intelligible evidence, we should be finally compelled to receive *some one* of them; we must, I apprehend, have PROOF much more tangible and much more satisfactory, than a self-destroying claim of the right to exercise an insulated Private Judgment in the matter of scriptural exposition.

It will be asked: *Where are we to seek this* PROOF?

I readily answer: *In the yet existing documents of primitive Christian Antiquity.*

If either Arminianism or Nationalism or Calvinism exhibit the truth, as the truth is meant to be conveyed in Scripture: certainly we may expect to find the System thus honourably distinguished, whichever of the three that System may be, conspicuously at least, if not controversially, drawn out and familiarly employed in the documents of the early Church Catholic.

The primitive Christians MUST have annexed *some* ideas to the scriptural terms *Election* and *Predestination:* and, when we recollect, that, by the necessity of chronology, they received their doctrinal instruction, either *quite immediately*, or *very closely mediately*, from the Apostles them-

selves; it is difficult to believe, that they could have universally annexed to them any other ideas than those which were annexed to them by their inspired and therefore infallible teachers*.

* That the Apostles were in the habit of personally and orally explaining, to the primitive Christians, the true import of the doctrines, which in the volume of the New Testament have been committed to imperishable writing; we could scarcely doubt, even from the very reason of the thing. But the matter, I apprehend, is fully established, as a fact, by St. Paul's frequent reference to this very mode of teaching.

Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the traditions as I delivered them to you. 1 Corinth. xi. 2.

Therefore, brethren, stand fast: and hold the traditions, which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle. 2 Thess. ii. 15.

Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother, that walketh disorderly and not after the tradition which ye received of us. 2 Thess. iii. 6.

We beseech you, brethren,—that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. 2 Thess. ii. 2.

I have received of the Lord that, which also I delivered unto you. 1 Corinth. xi. 23.

Now it is perfectly true, that *we*, who never heard the oral explanatory discourses of the Apostles, cannot, from our own personal knowledge, determine, as to what interpretations they gave of such or such now written doctrines; but *those*, who heard them, could by no possibility have been ignorant, as to what matters the Apostles really delivered, in this explanatory form, under the aspect of inspired revelations from heaven.

Hence, I conceive, the primitive Christians, who heard and conversed with the Apostles, *must* have well known, what the Apostles meant by the terms *Election* and *Predestination;* and, knowing this, they *must* have maintained the same doctrinal System as the Apostles did.

Such being the case, if, from *yet extant* documents, we can ascertain the doctrinal System of the primitive Christians in regard to Election and Predestination, we shall ascertain the doctrinal System of the Apostles themselves.

I need scarcely remark, that this early *written* tradition of the Church, as contained in Works which have actually come down to us, is widely

This view of the question makes the test of an alleged scriptural truth to be *Primeval Antiquity*.

In matters physical, new discoveries may perpetually be made: in matters mechanical, perhaps no limits can be assigned to the expansiveness of human ingenuity: in matters critical, new illustrations of ancient writings may frequently be brought out with considerable advantage: in matters prophetical, the latest commentator, as the sealed volume is gradually opened by the hand of time, *ought*, if he have really and soberly studied his subject, to be the most valuable. But, in matters theologically doctrinal, NOVELTY IS THE SYNONYME OF FALSEHOOD. The very notion and nature of a DIVINE REVELATION, as such, is EXACTNESS AND PERFECTION. Nothing can be added to it, beyond what it *originally* declared: nothing can be detracted from it, of what it *originally* propounded. It sets forth certain well-defined doctrines, which plainly constitute a System: and, beyond that, it is silent. Whatever doctrine, therefore, at a *subsequent* period, is started for the *first time*, the doctrine, thus circumstanced, being, by the very terms of the statement, *uncommunicated and unknown from the beginning*, must inevitably, by the mere fact of its newness, be a confessedly unrevealed, and hence an undoubtedly unauthoritative, doctrine. It may claim, indeed, to be *deduced* from Scripture: but, if it was never heard of till a period *subsequent* to the original divine revelation, and if it cannot be traced up to the original divine revelation itself as its universally received sense *from the beginning*, it is nothing

different from that vague unauthenticated oral tradition which the Romish Church pretends to have received from Antiquity, and which (through the Council of Trent she would place upon an equal footing of authority with Holy Scripture itself. Concil. Trident. Sess. iv. p. 7. 8. Antverp. A. D. 1644.

more respectable than a mere *human* invention or speculation*.

On this obvious principle, I would bring the three Schemes of Arminianism and Nationalism and Calvinism to the test of Primitive Antiquity.

If the disciples of the Apostles, and from them the disciples of what are called *Apostolic Men* in regular succession downward, universally received *one* of the three Schemes, rejecting the two others: then, as reasonable inquirers, on the sure ground of historical testimony, we stand bound to adopt the Scheme thus sanctioned by the hermeneutic voice of Primeval Christianity.

But, if the disciples of the Apostles, and after them the disciples of Apostolic men in regular succession downward, were equally ignorant of them *all;* and, still more, if they should be found to have universally received and communicated a Scheme totally different from *every one* of them: then, plainly, as reasonable inquirers, on the sure ground of historical testimony, we stand bound impartially to reject alike *all* the three Schemes in question.

IV. The principle, for which I contend, is so thoroughly rational and so perfectly intelligible, that, to every honestly investigating mind, it cannot fail most amply to approve itself. Yet a member of the Anglican Church may be

* Such was the *rationalè* of the excellent prescriptive canon of Tertullian, the sound good sense of which may well recommend it to every doctrinal inquirer who wishes rationally to satisfy either himself or others.

Adversus universas hæreses jam hinc præjudicatum sit: id esse verum quodcunque primum; id esse adulterum, quodcunque posterius. Tertull. adv. Prax. § 2. Oper. p. 405.

Ita, ex ipso ordine, manifestatur: id esse dominicum et verum, quod sit prius traditum; id autem extraneum et falsum, quod sit posterius immissum. Tertull. de præscript. adv. hær. § 11. Oper. p. 107.

additionally satisfied, when he learns, that the principle before us is the very principle adopted by that truly Apostolic Community.

Renouncing the self-sufficient licentiousness of that miscalled and misapprehended right of Private Judgment, which dogmatically pronounces upon the *meaning* of Scripture from a mere insulated *inspection* of Scripture, and which rapidly decides that such *must* be the sense of Scripture because an individual *thinks* that such *is* the sense of Scripture: renouncing this self-sufficient and strangely unsatisfactory licentiousness, the Church of England, with her usual sober and modest judiciousness, has always professed to build her code of doctrine, *authoritatively* indeed upon SCRIPTURE ALONE, but *hermeneutically* upon SCRIPTURE AS UNDERSTOOD AND EXPLAINED BY PRIMITIVE ANTIQUITY*.

Herein, she has judged well and wisely.

* Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that, whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. Art. vi.

Ista nos didicimus a Christo, ab Apostolis, et sanctis Patribus: et eadem bona fide docemus populum Dei. Juell. Apol. Eccles. Anglican. apud Enchirid. Theolog. vol. i. p. 228.

A primitiva Ecclesia, ab Apostolis, a Christo, non discessimus. Ibid. p. 295.

Nos, et ex Sacris Libris, quos scimus non posse fallere, certam quandam Religionis formam quæsivisse; et ad veterum Patrum atque Apostolorum primitivam Ecclesiam, hoc est, ad primordia atque initia, tanquam ad fontes, rediisse. Ibid. p. 340.

Opto, cum Melancthone et Ecclesia Anglicana, per canalem Antiquitatis deduci ad nos dogmata Fidei e fonte Sacræ Scripturæ derivata. Alioquin, quis futurus est novandi finis? Casaub. Epist. 744.

Quod si me conjectura non fallit, totius Reformationis pars integerrima est in Anglia: ubi, cum studio Veritatis, viget studium Antiquitatis. Casaub. Epist. 837.

Rex cum Ecclesia Anglicana pronunciat, eam demum se doctrinam

SCRIPTURE and ANTIQUITY are the two pillars, upon which all rationally established Faith must ultimately repose.

If we reject SCRIPTURE, we reject the very basis of theological belief: if we reject ANTIQUITY, we reject all historical evidence to soundness of interpretation.

When, in our inquiries after revealed truth, the two are combined, we attain to MORAL CERTAINTY: and, in matters which by their very nature admit not of mathematical proof, MORAL CERTAINTY is the highest point to which we can possibly attain.

pro vera simul et necessaria ad salutem agnoscere, quæ, e fonte Sacræ Scripturæ manans, per consensum veteris Ecclesiæ, ceu per canalem ad hæc tempora fuerit derivata. Casaub. Epist. 838.

CHAPTER II.

ARMINIANISM.

By the Arminians or Remonstrants, as we have recently seen, the IDEA of Scriptural Election is pronounced to be *The Election of certain individuals, out of the great mass of mankind, directly and immediately, to eternal life:* and the MOVING CAUSE of that Election is asserted to be *God's eternal Prevision of the future persevering holiness and consequent moral fitness of the individuals themselves, who thence have been thus elected.*

I. Respecting Predestination and Grace, the sentiments of the Remonstrants, as they propounded them anterior to the Synod of Dort in the year 1618, were summed up in the five following Articles.

1. God, from all eternity, determined, to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw to be about to persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus, and to inflict everlasting punishments on those who should continue in their unbelief and should resist unto the end his divine succours.

2. Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general and of every individual in particular. None, however, but those who believe in him, can be partakers of their divine benefit.

3. True faith cannot proceed, from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of Free Will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing. Therefore it is necessary to his conversion and sal-

vation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ.

4. This divine Grace or Energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorder of a corrupt nature, begins and advances and brings to perfection every thing that can be called good in man; and, consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone and to the operation of his Grace. Nevertheless, this Grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.

5. They, who are united to Christ by faith, are thereby furnished with abundant strength and with succours sufficient to enable them to triumph over the seduction of Satan and the allurements of sin and temptation. But the question, *Whether such* MAY *fall from their faith and forfeit finally this state of grace*, has not been yet resolved with sufficient perspicuity: and, therefore, it must be yet more carefully examined by an attentive study of what the Holy Scriptures have declared in relation to this important point*.

II. Such, with the exception, that the last of these five Articles, which, in its *original* construction, hesitated (we see) in respect to the point of *Final Perseverance*, had its hesitation subsequently removed by the introduction of a positive affirmation that *The Saints might fall away finally from a State of Grace*†: such was the exposition given by Arminius and the Remonstrants; and, though at first it encountered a somewhat fierce opposition, it has, to a very

* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. cent. XVII. sect. ii. part 2. chap. 3. § iv. vol. v. p. 444, 445.

† Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Ibid. p. 445.

wide extent, I believe, been received and adopted with much approbation.

1. Doubtless, it is abundantly plausible: because, through the CAVSATION of God's indisputable prevision of future actions whether good or bad, it undertakes to reconcile *God's decrees of Election and Reprobation* with *Man's notions of God's attribute of justice*. How it disposes of various texts which seem hard of agreement with its avowed theory of CAVSATION, I stop not now to inquire*. My present business is purely with the question of *Historical Testimony to Primeval Antiquity*.

If, then, the system, which usually bears the name of ARMINIANISM, do indeed set forth the sincere doctrine of Divine Revelation: in *that* case, we may expect to find it universally held and familiarly inculcated by the early Church.

But, if no such System can be detected as universally held and familiarly inculcated by the early Church; and, *a fortiori*, still more, if, in hereafter prosecuting the investigation, the early Church should be found to have held, as being apostolically received, a widely different System: in *that* case, agreeably to our proposed test, the Scheme of Arminianism must be rejected, as a mere human invention.

* Arminianism makes *The divinely foreseen holiness of particular individuals* to be the CAUSE of *Their Election*.

But the texts, to which I refer, exactly invert this process: for they make *The Election of particular individuals* to be the CAVSE of *Their holiness*. See Rom. viii. 29. Ephes. i. 4, 5. 1 Peter i. 2.

That Augustine should insist upon the order so plainly marked out in these texts, might naturally be expected: but Jerome, who, in modern nomenclature, was certainly no Calvinist, does the very same. See August. cont. Julian. lib. v. c. 4. Oper. vol. vii. p. 374. and Hieron. Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes. i. Oper. vol. vi. p. 162. Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruffin. lib. i. c. 6. Oper. vol. ii. p. 199.

which, having been introduced subsequent to the original delivery of the Gospel, can only be deemed an unauthoritative adulteration.

2. With a view to the solution of this question, I have examined the documents of the early Church as extensively and as attentively as I have been able: and I certainly must say, that, *as a System*, I have altogether failed to discover the Scheme proposed by Arminius and the Remonstrants.

(1.) Its theory of CAUSATION, namely *God's Prescience of an individual's future perseverance in holiness*, may indeed boast of a very considerable degree of antiquity: for, though it cannot be traced higher than Clement of Alexandria, who flourished at the latter end of the second century, and though his predecessors maintained a very different and (I think) a much more scriptural theory; yet, if an Arminian can be satisfied with *relative* instead of *positive* antiquity, from the time of Clement downward to the time of Augustine, it appears, with some exceptions, to have been generally adopted*.

(2.) But its theory of IDEALITY, namely *God's Election of certain individuals, directly and immediately, to eternal life*, I find not in the expositions of the early ecclesiastical writers. Nor, on this point, is it mere silence which we encounter. The IDEA of Election, which *they* set forth as the sense universally received by the Primitive Church, is, as we shall

* Clement of Alexandria is full and express, as to what he maintained to be the MOVING CAUSE of Election.

Τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. Oper. p. 765.

As an exception to the general subsequent adoption of this theory, I have noticed Jerome, who flourished in the fourth and fifth centuries. See below, book ii. chap. 3. § II. 2.

hereafter learn, essentially different from the IDEA of Election entertained by the Arminians*.

III. Hence, if the mode of reasoning, which I have adopted, be valid: historical testimony forbids us to receive Arminianism as the genuine mind of the Gospel; because that System was not acknowledged, as scriptural truth, by the early Christians, who, either immediately or almost immediately, derived their theology from the Apostles themselves.

* See below, book ii. chap. 2.

CHAPTER III.

NATIONALISM.

By the Nationalists, the IDEA of Election is determined to be *The Election of certain whole nations into the pale of the visible Church Catholic, which Election, however, relates purely to their privileged condition in this world, extending not to their collective eternal state in another world:* and the MOVING CAUSE of that Election is pronounced to be *That same absolute Good Pleasure of God, which, through the exercise of his sovereign power, led him to choose the posterity of Jacob, rather than the posterity of Esau, that upon earth they should become his peculiar people and be made the depositories and preservers of the true religion.*

I. I have stated, to the best of my apprehension, the points and bearings of the System now before us: lest, however, I should have mistaken its character, I subjoin, as a corrective, the evolution of it which has been given by Mr. Locke.

There was nothing more grating and offensive to the Jews, than the thoughts of having the Gentiles joined with them and partake equally in the privileges and advantages of the Kingdom of the Messiah: and, which was yet worse, to be told, that those aliens should be admitted, and that they, who presumed themselves children of that Kingdom, should be shut out.

St. Paul, who had insisted much on this doctrine in all the foregoing chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, to shew, that he had not done it out of any aversion or unkindness to his nation and brethren the Jews, does here, in the ninth chapter,

express his great affection to them, and declares an extreme concern for their salvation. But, withal, he shews, that, whatever privileges they had received from God above other nations, whatever expectation the promises made to their forefathers might raise in them; they had yet no just reason of complaining of God's dealing with them now under the Gospel, since it was according to his promise to Abraham and his frequent declarations in Sacred Scripture. Nor was it any injustice to the Jewish Nation: if God, by the same sovereign power, had preferred Jacob (the younger brother, without any merit of his) and his posterity to be his people, before Esau and his posterity whom he rejected. The earth is all his: nor have the nations, that possess it, any title of their own, but what he gives them, to the countries they inhabit or to the good things they enjoy; and he may dispossess or exterminate them, when he pleaseth.

As he destroyed the Egyptians for the glory of his name, in the deliverance of the Israelites: so he may, according to his Good Pleasure, raise or depress, take into favour or reject, the several nations of this world. And, particularly as to the nation of the Jews, all but a small remnant were rejected, and the Gentiles taken in in their room to be the People and Church of God, because they were a gainsaying and disobedient people that would not receive the Messiah whom he had promised and in the appointed time sent to them.

He, that will with moderate attention and indifferency of mind read this ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, will see, that, what is said of God's exercising of an absolute power according to the good pleasure of his will, relates only to Nations or Bodies Politic of men incorporated in civil Societies, which feel the effects of it only in the prosperity or calamity they meet with in this world, but extends not to their eternal state in another world, considered as particular persons,

wherein they stand each man by himself upon his own bottom, and shall so answer separately at the day of judgment. They may be punished here with their fellow-citizens, as part of a sinful Nation; and that be but temporal chastisement for their good: and yet be advanced to eternal life and bliss in the world to come.*

II. Following the plan which has been laid down, I shall now proceed to inquire: *Whether the Scheme, which has received the sanction of Mr. Locke, was that, which, from the beginning, was universally adopted, by the Church Catholic, as the genuine sense of Scripture.*

Now, respecting this matter, there undoubtedly occur passages, even in the very earliest writers, which, with sufficient plausibility, might be adduced in evidence. That the question, therefore, may be fairly examined, these passages shall be duly recited.

1. Clement of Rome, that friend of St. Paul, whose name the inspired Apostle declares to be written in the book of life, expresses himself in manner following.

Let us approach unto the Lord in holiness of soul, lifting up to him holy and unpolluted hands, loving our clement and merciful Father, who hath made us unto himself a part of the

* Locke's Paraph. on the Epist. to the Rom. sect. viii. Works, vol. iii. p. 308, 309. To the same effect runs the paraphrase of Rom. viii. 28–30.

We certainly know, that all things work together for good to those that love God, who are the Called according to his purpose of calling the Gentiles. In which purpose, the Gentiles, whom he foreknew, as he did the Jews, with an intention of kindness and of making them his people, he preordained to be conformable to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born, the chief, among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did thus preordain to be his people, them he also called, by sending preachers of the Gospel to them: and, whom he called, if they obeyed the truth, those he also justified by counting their faith for righteousness: and, whom he justified, them he also glorified; namely, in his purpose.

Election. For thus it is written: When the Most High divided the nations; as he scattered the sons of Adam, he appointed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the angels. Then his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord: Israel, the lot of his inheritance. And, in another place, he says: Behold, the Lord taketh unto himself a nation from the midst of the nations, as a man taketh the first-fruits of his threshing-floor: and, out of that nation, shall come the holy of holies.*

2. The testimony of Irenèus, who stood in the second succession from the Apostles, having been the disciple of Polycarp the disciple of St. John, may fitly be added to that of the Roman Clement.

By the tower of Election every where exalted and beautiful, the Lord God delivered, to other husbandmen paying fruits in their season, the figurative vineyard, now no longer hedged round, but expanded to the whole world. For, every where, the Church is illustrious; and, every where, is the wine-press dug round; because those, who receive the Spirit, are every where. The former husbandmen reprobated the Son of God: and, when they had killed him, they cast him out of the vineyard. Therefore God also has justly reprobated them: and has given the fructification of the culture to nations, which were without the vineyard.*

* Προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ εὔσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν, ὃς Ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ. Οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται· Ὅτε διεμέρισεν ὁ Ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς δὲ ἔσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδὰμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων· ἐγενήθη μερὶς Κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακὼβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. Καὶ, ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ, λέγει· Ἰδοὺ, Κύριος λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν ὥσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἅλω· καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια ἁγίων. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 29.

* Quapropter et tradidit eam Dominus Deus, non jam circumvallatam,

3. Ambrose follows these two primitive writers at a very considerable interval; for he flourished during the latter part of the fourth century: yet it may perhaps be thought, that he also bears witness to the same System, and consequently that the same System had continued to be received down even to his time.

There are none, who are rejected by Christ. But there are some, who are elected by the Lord: since the Lord calleth the things which are not, as though they were. And the nations of the Gentiles are elected, that the perfidy of the Jews might be destroyed.*

III. In the places, which have been recited, there is a *semblance* of evidence in favour of the Scheme of Nationalism: but, when they are explained by other passages of equal antiquity, the evidence, which they afford, cannot be deemed *more* than a mere semblance.

The IDEA, which they really convey, is not that *of The Election of certain whole nations into the Church, while, by the exercise of God's sovereignty, certain other whole nations are pretermitted or reprobated; an Election, relating purely to the privileged condition of the chosen nations in this world, and not extending to their collective eternal state in another world.*

sed expansam in universum mundum, aliis colonis reddentibus fructus temporibus suis, turre electionis exaltata ubique et speciosa. Ubique enim præclara est Ecclesia; et ubique circumfossum torcular: ubique enim sunt, qui suscipiunt Spiritum. Quoniam enim Filium Dei reprobaverunt, et ejecerunt eum, cum eum occidissent, extra vineam: justè reprobavit eos Deus; et, extra vineam existentibus gentibus, dedit fructificationem culturæ. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 70. p. 302.

* Non sunt, qui repudiantur a Christo. Sunt autem, qui eliguntur a Domino: quoniam Dominus vocat quæ non sunt, tanquam quæ sunt. Et electæ sunt gentium nationes, ut destrueretur perfidia Judæorum. Ambros. Enarr. in Psalm. xliii. Oper. p. 1380.

But the IDEA, which they convey, is that of *The Jews collectively being esteemed one people or nation; while the Gentiles, who have been individually brought into the Church, are collectively, within the pale of the Church, another people or nation: the benefit of this Election not being confined to certain privileges in this world only; but, so far as God's purpose and intention and generic conditional promises are concerned, extending to eternal life in another world.*

Accordingly, in those other passages to which I have referred, it is distinctly intimated: that, when the nations are said to be elected, not *Some whole nations, as contradistinguished from other whole nations,* are meant, but *Various individuals out of the great body of the Nations or Gentiles, as contradistinguished from the single Nation of the Jews.*

1. To this purpose speaks Clement of Rome.

May the all-seeing God, who elected the Lord Jesus Christ and us through him to be a peculiar people, grant, to every soul that calleth upon his great and holy name, faith, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, temperance, holiness, and wisdom.*

2. To the same purpose speaks Justin Martyr.

Inasmuch as he took out of all nations the nation of the Jews, a nation useless and disobedient and faithless: he hath shewn, that those, who have been elected out of every nation, are, through Christ, obedient to his counsel†.

* Ὁ πανόπτης Θεὸς,—ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον, δώη, πάσῃ ψυχῇ ἐπικεκλημένῃ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, πίστιν, φόβον, εἰρήνην, ὑπομονὴν, μακροθυμίαν, ἐγκράτειαν, ἁγνείαν, καὶ σωφροσύνην. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 58.

† Ἐκ πάντων δὲ τῶν γενῶν, γένος ἑαυτῷ λαβὼν τὸ ὑμέτερον (scil. τῶν Ἰουδαίων), γένος ἄχρηστον καὶ ἀπειθὲς καὶ ἄπιστον, δείξας τοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς γένους αἱρουμένους πεπεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τῇ βουλῇ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 282.

3. To the same purpose, again, speaks Irenèus.

*The wages of Jacob were variegated sheep: and the wages of Christ are men collected out of various and different nations into one cohort of the faith**.

The universal going forth of the People from Egypt was, from God, a type and image of the future going forth of the Church from the nations†.

4. To the same purpose, finally, speaks Ambrose.

When the Lord says to his disciples, that is, to the apostles; If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me: *he speaks to Levites. Nevertheless, the passage;* Ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, an adopted people: *is addressed to all*‡.

IV. On the whole, for the general reception, or even for the bare existence of the Scheme of Nationalism in the Primitive Church, as I understand that Scheme to be developed by Mr. Locke, I am unable to discover any evidence. What evidence we have, is, in truth, hostile to it.

Therefore, like the Scheme of Arminianism, I conceive, that it must be dismissed, as a novelty, and thence (in the language of Tertullian) as an adulteration.

* Variæ oves, quæ fiebant hinc Jacob merces: et Christi merces, ex variis et differentibus gentibus, in unam cohortem fidei convenientes fiunt homines. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 38. p. 272.

† Universa enim quæ ex Ægypto profectio fiebat populi, a Deo typus et imago fiebat profectionis Ecclesiæ quæ erat futura ex gentibus. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 50. p. 286.

‡ Dominus Levitis dicit, cum, discipulis suis, hoc est, Apostolis dicit: *Si quis vult post me venire, abneget semetipsum, et tollat crucem suam, et sequatur me.* Quanquam ad omnes jam dictum sit: *Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus in adoptionem.* Ambros. de fug. sæcul. c. ii. Oper. p. 198.

CHAPTER IV.

CALVINISM.

By the Calvinists, the IDEA of Election is judged to be *The Election of certain individuals, out of the great mass of mankind, directly and immediately, to eternal life, while all other individuals are either passively left or actively doomed to a certainty of eternal death*: and the MOVING CAUSE of that Election is defined to be *God's unconditional and irrespective Will and Pleasure, inherent in, and exercised in consequence of, his absolute and uncontroulable Sovereignty.*

Such, in brief, is the Scheme which usually bears the name *of Calvinism:* but, from the circumstance of its very wide ramification and from its claim of propounding the very essentials of the Gospel as taught and delivered by the Apostles themselves, it will require a much more extended discussion and examination than either of the two Schemes of Arminianism and Nationalism.

At the Synod of Dort which sat in the year 1618, this peculiar System of Scripture Exposition was conveniently exhibited under the form of five distinct Articles setting forth five distinct Points of Doctrine.

I. These five Articles were arranged and summed up in the following manner and order.

1. According to the fixed PREDESTINATION of God, which, as its *moving cause*, rests, not upon any impulsory prevision of men's future characters and conduct, but altogether upon the Divine Pleasure and Sovereignty: some individuals, by a decree of *Election*, are, out of the great mass of mankind,

absolutely chosen to a certainty of eternal happiness; while, by a decree of *Reprobation*, all other individuals are absolutely passed over and left to a certainty of eternal misery*.

2. Although, from its infinite value, the death of the Son of God is abundantly *sufficient* to expiate the sins of the whole world: yet, according to God's sovereign will, its beneficial operation is so limited, that, in point of *efficacy*, it procures, solely and exclusively, the PARTICULAR REDEMPTION of those

* Quod aliqui in tempore fide a Deo donantur, aliqui non donantur, id ab æterno ipsius decreto provenit; *omnia enim opera sua novit ab æterno:* secundum quod decretum, Electorum corda, quantumvis dura, gratiosè emollit, et ad credendum inflectit; non electos autem, justo judicio, suæ malitiæ et duritiæ relinquit. Atque hic potissimum sese nobis aperit profunda, misericors pariter et justa, hominum æqualiter perditorum discretio: sive decretum illud Electionis et Reprobationis in verbo Dei revelatum.

Est autem Electio immutabile Dei propositum, quo, ante jacta mundi fundamenta, ex universo genere humano ex primæva integritate in peccatum et exitium sua culpa prolapso, secundum liberrimum voluntatis suæ beneplacitum, ex mera gratia, certam quorundam hominum multitudinem, aliis nec meliorum nec digniorum, sed in communi miseria cum aliis jacentium, ad salutem elegit in Christo.

Causa vero hujus gratuitæ Electionis est solum Dei beneplacitum, non in eo consistens, quod certas qualitates seu actiones humanas, ex omnibus possibilibus, in salutis conditionem elegit; sed in eo, quod certas quasdam personas ex communi peccatorum multitudine sibi in peculium adscivit.

Cæterum in æternam et gratuitam hanc Electionis nostræ gratiam eo vel maximè illustrat nobisque commendat Scriptura Sacra, quod porro testatur, non omnes homines esse electos, sed quosdam non electos sive in æterna Dei Electione præteritos, quos scilicet Deus, ex liberrimo, justissimo, irreprehensibili, et immutabili, beneplacito, decrevit in communi miseria, in quam se sua culpa præcipitârunt, relinquere, nec salvifica fide et conversionis gratia donare, sed, in viis suis et sub justo judicio relictos, tandem, non tantum propter infidelitatem sed etiam cætera omnia peccata, ad declarationem justitiæ suæ, damnare et æternum punire. Atque hoc est decretum Reprobationis. Judic. Synod. Dordrech. c. i. de Divin. Prædest. § 6, 7, 10, 15.

who from all eternity have been irreversibly elected to salvation*.

3. Man's corruption, in consequence of the fall of Adam, is such, that all are conceived in sin and are born the children of wrath, unapt to any salutary goodness, propense to evil, dead in trespasses, and the slaves of iniquity: nor does this inherent corruption or this ORIGINAL SIN arise from a mere imitation of Adam; but, by the just judgment of God, it is conveyed and communicated through the propagation of a vicious nature†.

4. The Elect, no less than the Reprobate, being unable, by any inherent strength of their own, to turn themselves unto God and holiness, receive, in due time, a morally invincible EFFECTUAL CALLING, which, through the Divine Grace surely operating upon their hearts, they willingly and cheerfully obey‡.

* Mors Filii Dei est unica et perfectissima pro peccatis victima et satisfactio, infiniti valoris et pretii, abundè sufficiens ad totius mundi peccata expianda.

Fuit hoc Dei Patris liberrimum consilium et gratiosissima voluntas atque intentio, ut mortis pretiosissimæ Filii sui vivifica et salvifica efficacia sese exereret in omnibus Electis, ad eos solos perducendos: hoc est, voluit Deus, ut Christus, per sanguinem crucis quo novum fœdus confirmavit, ex omni populo, tribu, gente, et lingua, eos omnes et solos, qui ab æterno ad salutem electi et a Patre ipsi dati sunt, efficaciter redimeret. Judic. Synod. Dordrech. c. ii. de Redemp. § 3, 8.

† Qualis post lapsum fuit homo, tales et liberos procreavit; nempe corruptus, corruptos: corruptione ab Adamo in omnes posteros (solo Christo excepto), non per imitationem (quod Pelagiani olim voluerunt), sed per vitiosæ naturæ propagationem, justo Dei judicio, derivata.

Itaque omnes homines in peccato concipiuntur, et filii iræ nascuntur, inepti ad omne bonum salutare, propensi ad malum, in peccatis mortui, et peccati servi. Judic. Synod. Dordrech. c. iii. de Homin. Corrupt. § 2, 3.

‡ Quotquot per Evangelium vocantur, serio vocantur.

Quod multi, per ministerium Evangelii vocati, non veniunt et non

5. Thus being made willing in the day of God's power, and thus obeying his Efficacious Call, the Elect, though they may occasionally fall into sin, yet, in consequence of the immutability of the Divine Decree, are always recovered to righteousness: and thence, by the grace of FINAL PERSEVERANCE, through the appointed medium of general holiness, they at length obtain that heavenly felicity to which they had been eternally predestinated*.

II. Such were the five Articles: and they obviously propounded and vindicated the five following Points of Doctrine:

1. PREDESTINATION, branching out into *Election* and *Reprobation;*

convertuntur, hujus culpa non est in Evangelio, nec in Christo per Evangelium oblato, nec in Deo per Evangelium vocante, sed in vocatis ipsis.

Quod autem alii, per ministerium Evangelii vocati, veniunt et convertuntur, id non est adscribendum homini, tanquam seipsum per liberum arbitrium ab aliis pari vel sufficiente gratia ad fidem et conversionem instructis discernenti (quod superba Pelagii hæresis statuit), sed Deo, qui, ut suos ab æterno in Christo elegit, ita eosdem in tempore efficaciter vocat, fide et resipiscentia donat, et e potestate tenebrarum erutos in Filii sui regnum transfert. Judic. Synod. Dordrech. c. iv. de Convers. Mod. § 8, 9, 10.

* Deus, qui dives est misericordia, ex immutabili Electionis proposito, Spiritum Sanctum, etiam in tristibus lapsibus, a suis non prorsus aufert, nec eousque eos prolabi sinit, ut gratia adoptionis, justificationis statu, excidant, aut peccatum ad mortem sive in Spiritum Sanctum committant, et ab eo penitus deserti in exitium æternum sese præcipitent.

Ita, non suis meritis aut viribus, sed ex gratuita Dei misericordia, id obtinent, ut nec totaliter fide et gratia excidant, nec finaliter in lapsibus maneant aut pereant. Quod, quoad ipsos, non tantum facile fieri posset, sed et indubiè fieret; respectu autem Dei, omnino non potest: cum nec consilium ipsius mutari, promissio excidere, vocatio secundum propositum revocari, Christi meritum, intercessio, et custodia, irrita reddi, nec Spiritus Sancti obsignatio frustanea fieri aut deleri, possit. Judic. Synod. Dordrech. c. v. de Persever. Sanct. § 6, 8.

2. PARTICULAR REDEMPTION;

3. ORIGINAL SIN;

4. EFFECTUAL CALLING;

5. FINAL PERSEVERANCE.

III. But Calvinism admits of yet a further modification, which the Divines of Dort, agreeing to condemn the Arminians or Remonstrants, and unwilling (I suppose) to exhibit any dissention among themselves, have not introduced into their evolution of the five leading Articles: the modification, I mean, of what are called *Supralapsarianism* and *Sublapsarianism.*

1. According to the Supralapsarian Theory, God not only foresaw, but likewise actually predestinated, the fall of man: that so he might gain glory to himself by the wonderful plan of Particular Redemption.

2. But, according to the more moderate Sublapsarian Theory, God foresaw indeed, but did not absolutely predestinate, the fall of man: yet, from his certain and infallible prevision of man's fall, he equally, from all eternity, contrived the plan of Particular Redemption to his own endless honour and glory.

IV. Some persons, I believe, have occasionally described the high doctrinal successors of Calvin, as more calvinistic than Calvin himself.

This, however, is a mistake. The great Genevan Reformer, with consistent intrepidity, was, in truth, so far as doctrine is concerned, the highest of the high. Fearlessly pushing his principles to their full legitimate extent, he at once maintained, without any restriction or disguise, both the dogma of *Reprobation* and the theory of *Supralapsarianism**.

* The five points, with the appended tenet of Supralapsarianism, are

Higher than this, in the scale of God's alleged absolute decrees, it is, I apprehend, impossible for any person to advance.

distinctly, though not in formal successive enumeration, propounded by Calvin.

Nunquam liquido, ut decet, persuasi erimus, salutem nostram ex fonte gratuitæ misericordiæ Dei fluere, donec innotuerit nobis æterna ejus ELECTIO: quæ, hac comparatione, gratiam Dei illustrat, quod non omnes promiscuè adoptat in spem salutis, sed dat aliis, quod aliis negat. Hujus principii ignorantia quantum ex gloria Dei imminuat, quantum veræ humilitati detrahat, palam est. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 21. § 1.

Quod ergo Scriptura clarè ostendit, dicimus: æterno et immutabili consilio Deum semel constituisse quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursum exitio devovere. Hoc consilium, quoad ELECTOS, in gratuita ejus misericordia fundatum esse asserimus, nullo humanæ dignitatis respectu: quos vero damnationi addicit, his, justo quidem et irreprehensibili, sed incomprehensibili, ipsius judicio, vitæ aditum præcludi. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 21. § 7.

Quemadmodum vocatione et justificatione ELECTOS suos Dominus signat, ita REPROBOS vel a notitia sui nominis, vel a Spiritus sui sanctificatione, excludendo, quale maneat eos judicium, istis veluti nobis aperit. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 21. § 7.

Multi quidem, ac si invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, ELECTIONEM ita fatentur, ut negent quenquam reprobari; sed inscitè nimis et pueriliter: quando ipsa ELECTIO, ni REPROBATIONI opposita, non staret.—Quos ergo Deus præterit, reprobat; neque alia de causa, nisi quod ab hæreditate, quam filiis suis prædestinat, illos vult excludere. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 23. § 1.

Decretum quidem horribile, fateor: inficiari tamen nemo poterit, quin præsciverit Deus quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet; et ideo præsciverit, quia decreto suo sic ordinat. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 23. § 7.

Quicunque sunt EX REPROBORUM numero, ut sunt vasa in contumeliam formata, ita non desinunt perpetuis flagitiis iram Dei in se provocare et evidentibus signis confirmare quod jam in se latum est Dei judicium: tantum abest, ut cum ipso frustra contendant. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 23. § 14.

Hic jam se exerit immensa Dei bonitas, sed non omnibus in salutem: quo REPROBOS manet gravius judicium, quod testimonium amoris Dei

repudiant. Atque etiam Deus, illustrandæ gloriæ suæ causa, Spiritus sui efficaciam ab illis subducit. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 2.

Quemadmodum suæ erga Electos VOCATIONIS EFFICACIA, salutem, ad quam eos æterno consilio destinârat, perficit Deus: ita sua habet adversus Reprobos judicia, quibus consilium de illis suum exequatur. Quos ergo in vitæ contumeliam et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent et severitatis exempla, eos, ut in finem suum perveniant, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus prædicatione magis excæcat et obstupefacit. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 12.

Si ad ELECTIONIS originem revocandi sumus, ut constet non aliunde quam ex mera Dei liberalitate contingere nobis salutem, qui hoc extinctum volunt, malignè, quantum in se est, obscurant quod magnificè ac plenis buccis celebrandum erat, et ipsam humilitatis radicem evellunt. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 21. § 1.

Si non possumus rationem assignare cur suos misericordia dignatur, nisi quoniam ita illi placet: neque etiam, in aliis reprobandis, aliud habebimus quam ejus voluntatem. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 22. § 11.

Proinde, quos Deus sibi filios assumpsit, non in ipsis eos dicitur elegisse, sed in Christo suo.—Quod si in eo sumus electi, non in nobis ipsis reperiemus Electionis nostræ certitudinem: ac ne in Deo quidem Patre, si nudum illum absque Filio imaginamur.—Toties repetitur hæc doctrina: *Filio unigenito non pepercit Pater, ut, quisquis credit in eum, non pereat.* Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 5.

Jam vero in Electis VOCATIONEM statuimus ELECTIONIS testimonium. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 21. § 7.

Quum suos eligendo jam in filiorum locum Dominus adoptavit; videmus tamen, ut in tanti boni possessionem non veniant nisi dum VOCANTUR.—Deus EFFICACITER Electos suos docet, ut ad FINEM adducat. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 1.

Ipsa quoque VOCATIONIS natura et dispensatio perspicuè id demonstrat: quæ, non sola verbi prædicatione, sed et Spiritus illuminatione, constat. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 2.

Interior igitur hæc VOCATIO pignus est salutis, quod fallere non potest. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 2.

Nihil erit ambiguum, si tenemus quod debet ex superioribus liquere, duplicem esse VOCATIONIS speciem. Est enim UNIVERSALIS VOCATIO, qua per externam verbi prædicationem omnes pariter ad se invitat Deus: etiam quibus, eam, in mortis odorem et gravioris condemnationis materiam, proponit. Est altera SPECIALIS, qua ut plurimum solos fideles dignatur: dum interiore sui Spiritus illuminatione efficit, ut verbum prædicatum eorum cordibus insideat.—Illa impiorum etiam communis est: hæc secum affert Spiritum regenerationis, qui est arrhabo et sigil-

lum futuræ hæreditatis, quo in diem Domini obsignantur corda nostra. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 8.

Enimvero ELECTI, nec statim ab utero, nec eodem omnes tempore, sed prout visum est Deo suam illis gratiam dispensare, in ovile Christi per vocationem aggregantur. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 10.

Jam quorsum ELECTIO pertinet, nisi ut, in filiorum locum a cœlesti Patre coöptati, ejus favore salutem et immortalitatem obtineamus? Quantumlibet revolvas et excutias, ultimum tamen ejus scopum non ultra tendere intelliges. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 5.

Accedit, ad stabiliendam fiduciam, alia, quam cum VOCATIONE nostra conjungi diximus, ELECTIONIS FIRMITUDO. Quos enim nominis sui cognitione illuminatos in Ecclesiæ suæ sinum Christus asciscit, eos dicitur in fidem tutelamque suam recipere. Quoscunque autem recipit, ei a Patre commissi dicuntur ac concrediti, ut in vitam æternam custodiantur.—Denique ipsa experientia satis docemur, parvi esse Vocationem et Fidem, nisi accedat PERSEVERANTIA, quæ non omnibus contingit. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 6.

Nec absurdum videri debet, quod dico: Deum non modo primi hominis casum, et in eo posterorum ruinam, prævidisse; sed, ARBITRIO QUOQUE SUO, DISPENSASSE. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 23. § 7.

CHAPTER V.

SEMICALVINISM.

I HAVE now, to the best of my knowledge, without either disguise or misrepresentation, faithfully exhibited the System, which, in the present day, is usually termed *Calvinism*. But there is a softened arrangement of the Scheme, to which the name of *Moderate Calvinism* is frequently applied. Perhaps, according to the general analogy of doctrinal nomenclature, *Semicalvinism* might be a more regular appellation.

According to this subdued arrangement, Reprobation, either by a studied silence, or under the modestly cautious name of *Preterition*, is kept out of sight: and, for the scarcely perceptible, and to the individuals concerned really unimportant, distinction involved in the use of that name, somewhat of a plea is set up, by a denial of that second Point which propounds the doctrine of *The Particular Redemption of the Elect only*.

The mitigated Scheme, which I would denominate *Semicalvinism*, has been very well stated by Mr. Milner, the late pious historian of The Church of Christ.

God's Predestination and Election of some souls to glory is so far from narrowing (*as is often thought*) *the way to heaven, that, remove it really, and the way to heaven is shut altogether. All others have just as good an ability for obtaining salvation by Christ, as they would have had, were there no Election of Grace. If the Lord bring some effectually to heaven, that, surely, is not excluding others.*—

All men may be saved, if they please. There wants the will only. But such is our natural enmity against God, that, though the blood of his Son was freely spilt for ALL MEN WITHOUT EXCEPTION, *not one soul would return to God by true repentance, were it not for his blessed and adorable purpose of Election, which, before the foundation of the world, determined, that Some souls should be benefited by his* UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION *and led to repentance toward God and to faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. The gift of his Son is as well a gift to others, as to them: but, by the special influence of the Holy Ghost, the Elect People of God are inclined to receive what the Lord freely gives.*

In thus making the work of God the Son UNIVERSAL, *and the work of God the Holy Ghost* PARTICULAR, *I speak with our Church-Reformers, who understood our present subject much better than many, either Calvinists or Arminians, in our days. And, if, in speaking with the Church-Reformers, I seem, to some, to speak inconsistently: I am the more confirmed thereby, that I state the doctrine aright, and that they who find fault err themselves in one extreme or other.*

One passage, in the Church Catechism, shews their peculiar view of the subject.

God the Son, who hath redeemed me and ALL MANKIND.

Here is UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION.

God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and ALL THE ELECT PEOPLE OF GOD.

Here is ELECTING GRACE.—

For once I have set forth the Scripture doctrine of Election at large. It is intended, by the Father of mercies, to afford strong comfort to his tempted, yet sincere, children. Let them take the comfort from it that is intended: and may the Lord bless it to them! Let those, who cannot receive the doctrine, be quiet and patient at present: saying, What I see not,

teach thou me. This is more proper, than to cavil and dispute.*

* Milner's Practical Sermons, vol. ii. serm. 17. p. 243–247. The text of this sermon is 2 Tim. ii. 19: *Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth them that are his; and Let every one, that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity.* Now that text Mr. Milner professedly applies to the doctrine of *Election*, according to his own view of such doctrine. Hence I think it right to state, that, so far as I can judge, he has totally misapprehended the import of the passage.

I. In *no* sense of the word, whether calvinistic or arminian or national, is St. Paul *there* treating of the scriptural doctrine of *Election*.

On the contrary, he is opposing the mischievous fancy of Hymenèus and Philetus: who, by saying that *The Resurrection is past already*, overthrew the faith of some unstable and novelty-loving disciples.

1. Probably, these heresiarchs denied *A future Resurrection to eternal life*, through the medium of asserting that *There is no Resurrection save a figurative resurrection at Baptism from the death of sin.* Be that, however, as it may, the Apostle, in avowed opposition to the present fancy, elsewhere luminously teaches us: that the doctrine of *A future Resurrection from the dead* is the very foundation of Christianity.

How say some among you: that There is no Resurrection of the dead? If there be no Resurrection of the dead; then is Christ not risen: and, if Christ be not risen; then is our preaching vain, and YOUR FAITH IS ALSO VAIN. 1 Corinth. xv. 12–14.

2. Now, this foundation, the idle figment of Hymenèus and Philetus went immediately to subvert.

Hence, in direct contextual reference to such an attempt, St. Paul distinctly says: NEVERTHELESS, *the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth those who are his; and Let every one, that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity.* 2 Tim. ii. 19.

That is to say: NOTWITHSTANDING the subversive efforts of Hymenèus and Philetus, the true foundation of God, or the doctrine of *A future Resurrection from the dead*, standeth sure. And this true foundation has a two-fold seal: *The Lord, knowing his own really sound preachers of the Gospel, broadly distinguishes them from those false teachers who would overturn its very basis;* and *Let every genuine Christian renounce the unhallowed speculation of those heresiarchs, which, by denying A future Resurrection from the dead, has a plain tendency to encourage a secure perseverance in sinning.*

I. What the present Scheme gains in decent moderation, it certainly loses in harmonious concinnity: and, as such, I can have no scruple in saying, that, on principles of exact inductive reasoning, it is a deterioration of the more uncompromising Scheme proposed by Calvin and accepted by the Synod of Dort.

1. Semicalvinism, like perfect Calvinism, plainly rests upon the basis: that *Election, as propounded and explained alike by each Scheme, is the undoubted doctrine of Scripture.*

Such being the case, on what satisfactory principles Semicalvinism can be maintained, I own myself unable to comprehend.

Genuine Calvinism, viewed as starting from the dogma of its own well-defined *Election*, is a System preëminently round and compact. Not a stone can be displaced without shaking the whole edifice. Grant to a true Calvinist his premises; namely, *The strict correctness of his definition of the scriptural term* ELECTION: and his entire Scheme, so far as I can perceive, will be irrefragable. All the rest, if we except perhaps the nice distinction of Supralapsarianism or Sublapsarianism, will follow by a sort of logical necessity. But, the moment this rotundity is invaded, the chaotic reign of Doctrinal Inconsistency commences.

2. If *some* are Elect, the *remainder* must inevitably be

II. Such, I apprehend, is the true drift and import of the passage.

It is not a mere insulated text, the exposition of which depends upon itself alone: but, as any person may see who will examine the context, it is immediately bound, by the force of the word μέντοι or *nevertheless*, to the passage which directly precedes it.

That passage, however, *limits* its application to the heresy, which declared that *The Resurrection is past already.*

Consequently, it forbids us to view it, as treating of what Mr. Milner denominates *The two seals of Election:* namely, *God's eternal decree*, on the one hand; and *The personal holiness of God's Elect*, on the other hand.

Non-Elect. Hence, to say, that the Non-Elect are only *passed over* by God; and to deny, that they are formally *reprobated* by him: is, at least practically to the sufferers, a distinction without a difference.

Whether the mass are *left* to inevitable eternal damnation, or whether they are specifically *doomed* to it, may peradventure enable a disputant to set forth some subtle distinction between two possible operations of the divine mind: the operation, to wit, of *Simple Prevision;* and the operation of *Active Predestination:* though it may be doubted, whether even *this* distinction can be legitimately sustained. For, to *leave* a person to INEVITABLE damnation, when such leaving is altogether *spontaneous*, is an act of *volition*, no less than an act of *prevision:* and, if once the idea of *volition* be introduced or admitted, there can be no real difference between *spontaneously leaving* a person to INEVITABLE damnation, and *spontaneously dooming* a person to INEVITABLE damnation. Be this, however, as it may, still, let us employ what mere terms we most affect, if the mass of the Non-Elect be either *left* or *doomed* to INEVITABLE destruction (and, I believe, neither Calvinist nor Semicalvinist denies the destruction of the Non-Elect to *be* INEVITABLE), the result will equally be: that *None, save the Elect, either will or can be saved;* and consequently, that *All the Non-Elect, whether verbally we may choose to describe them as the Pretermitted or the Reprobated, neither will nor can escape eternal damnation.*

3. So again: to say, as the Semicalvinists say; that *All men may be saved if they please*, and that *In order to a finally beneficial acceptance of the Gospel there wants the will only:* strikes me, I must freely confess, as being little better than a disingenuous paltering with ambiguous phraseology.

Doubtless, there wants only *the will:* but, if the good Spirit

of God strives with the Elect *exclusively* that they may have the will, and if (as all, save Pelagians, acknowledge) *no* person ever can have the will without the prevenient striving of God's Spirit; it is mere trifling and absolute mockery to tell the Non-Elect, that *All men may be saved if they please.*

I myself greatly prefer the open and undisguised language of unadulterated Calvinism.

That System, through the mouth of the uncompromising Reformer of Geneva, fearlessly and distinctly states: that, so far from the Spirit of God striving with the Reprobate to give *them* a good will, every ordinance designedly works only to *their* eternal ruin.

*Those persons, whom the Lord, in order that they may be organs of his wrath and examples of his severity, has created to contumely of life and to destruction of death: those persons, I say, in order that they may come duly to their end, he, one while, deprives of the faculty of hearing his word; and, another while, even by the very preaching of it, the more blinds and stupefies**.

Lo, he directs, indeed, his voice to them; but only that they may be the more deaf: he kindles light before them; but only that they may be made the more blind: he propounds doctrine to them; but only that, by it, they may be the more stupefied: he applies the remedy to them; but only that they may not be healed†.

* Quos ergo in vitæ contumeliam et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent et severitatis exempla, eos, ut in finem suum perveniant, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus prædicatione magis excæcat et obstupefacit. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 24. § 12.

† Ecce, vocem ad eos dirigit; sed ut magis obsurdescant: lucem accendit; sed ut reddantur cæciores; doctrinam profert; sed qua magis obstupescant: remedium adhibet; sed ne sanentur. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 24. § 13.

However this may sound in the ears of a Semicalvinist, his own apparently moderated Scheme, let him in words disguise it as he may, virtually brings out the very same result.

3. Furthermore, to say, that *All are redeemed*, but that *A certain number only are elected to eternal life while the remainder are so left as* INEVITABLY *to perish*: or, in other words, to maintain conjointly the two doctrines of *Universal Redemption* and *Particular Election*: this, so far as I can perceive, is to contend for the coëxistence of two matters palpably and necessarily incompatible.

The complete Calvinist will readily tell his semicalvinistic brother: that *Universal Redemption*, associated with *Particular Election*, is an inconsistent mockery, which, however speciously disguised, *really* exhibits the Almighty as even *systematically* and *predeterminately* acting in vain. For what can be more fruitless and unmeaning, than *A Plan of Universal Redemption, deliberately and advisedly, to a vast extent, rendered ineffective, by its association with a coördinate plan of Particular Election and Particular Preterition?* Such a plan were clearly to pull down with one hand, what is built up with the other.

If the *premises* of the complete Calvinist be admitted, namely, his definition of the scriptural term *Election*; premises, be it observed, fully admitted, or rather indeed insisted upon, by the Semicalvinist: we must inevitably, as Calvin himself well argued, either receive his whole System as the truth, or renounce Christianity as a fable*. But, from

* Multi quidem, ac si invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, Electionem ita fatentur, ut negent quenquam reprobari; sed inscitè nimis et pueriliter: quando ipsa Electio, ni Reprobationi opposita, non staret.—Quos ergo Deus præterit, reprobat: neque alia de causa, nisi quod ab hæreditate, quam filiis suis prædestinat, illos vult excludere. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii.. c. 23. § 1.

these same *premises*, it is impossible, with any decent shew of argument, to deduce legitimately the mutilated System of Semicalvinism. The very idea of *Election to eternal life* involves and supposes the idea of *Reprobation to eternal death:* and, to say that *Redemption can be viewed as extending to persons thus eternally and irrevocably in God's counsels reprobated to misery*, is to advance a self-contradictory proposition.

5. In making this remark, I speak of Semicalvinism, as defined by Mr. Milner, and as *now* advocated by many very excellent individuals. Doubtless, there *has* been a modification of the mitigated Scheme, which seems to have been contrived for the purpose of removing the obvious charge of inconsistency.

According to such a modification, some persons, by special grace and by the sovereign will of God, are particularly elected to eternal life: while the remainder, inasmuch as Redemption is Universal, are neither absolutely elected to salvation, nor absolutely reprobated to damnation. Hence the individuals, who compose the remainder, either may, or may not, be saved: though, if they *be* saved, it will not be by a formal decree of Absolute Election: and, if they *be* damned, it will not be by a formal decree of Absolute Reprobation.

The present Scheme, so far as I can understand it, may be deemed a sort of Theological Hermaphrodite; one side of which exhibits the features of Calvinism, while the other dimly shews the masked form of Pelagianism.

I venture to say *Pelagianism:* for, on no other principles, do I see, how it is to extricate the Semicalvinist from his difficulties.

Some individuals, it tells us, are neither elected nor reprobated: and, as such, these indifferential individuals either may, or may not, be saved.

How, except on pelagian principles, can this be?

By the very terms of the Scheme, the individuals are left to themselves, either to sink or to swim, as best they may.

Such being the case, if, on the one hand, they at all savingly turn to righteousness: then they must so turn by their own unaided powers; and thus, with Pelagius, the need of prevenient Divine Grace will manifestly be dispensed with.

While, on the other hand, if the assistance of that Divine Grace, which is alone granted to the Elect, be withheld from them; and if it be admitted, as on sound scriptural principles it *must* be admitted, that they cannot turn without it; then the inconsistency remains in all its original force; and we immediately perceive the gross contradictoriness of a Scheme, which, to secure the doctrine of *Universal Redemption*, vainly alleges, that the mass of the Non-elected either may, or may not, be saved.

The contriver of this unstable System was, I believe, Mr. Baxter: and it seems to have been adopted by Milton; who, with more confidence than modesty, has ventured to exhibit the Deity himself as propounding it*.

II. My remarks on Semicalvinism have hitherto been *general*. With every feeling of respect for the memory of Mr. Milner, I may now be permitted to offer a few observations on the preceding passage *in particular*. So high, with many pious Christians, is the authority of that excellent man, that my strictures (if *strictures* I must call them) will not, I trust, be deemed either superfluous or impertinent.

1. Mr. Milner professedly indicates his mixed System by the example of our Anglican Church-Reformers. If *he* is inconsistent, in associating Universal Redemption with Par-

* See Paradise Lost, book iii. ver. 168–202.

ticular Election to eternal life: *they*, precisely after the same manner, are inconsistent also.

It may be doubted, whether the vindication of inconsistency *by* inconsistency can ever, in the very nature of things, be deemed valid and satisfactory. The present vindication, however, plainly goes on the presumption: that *The words Election and Elect are used, in the same* SENSE, *both by himself and by our Church-Reformers.*

Now this presumption, I take it, is neither more nor less, than a palpable begging of the question. Where, I venture to ask, is the PROOF, that *Such a presumption is well founded?* Certainly, Mr. Milner has *given* no proof: and I incline to think, that even the clause, which he has himself cited from the Church Catechism, is fatal to his claim of doctrinal identity. *Every* catechumen is taught to say, that *God the Holy Ghost sanctifieth* ME *and* ALL THE ELECT PEOPLE OF GOD. Therefore, if the clause proves any thing, it will not prove, that *Our Church-Reformers understood the doctrine of Election, as Mr. Milner understood it;* but it will prove, that, *In the judgment of our Church-Reformers,* EVERY *baptised catechumen, according to their views of the doctrine of Election, is one of God's Elected People.*

2. Mr. Milner undoubtingly states: that *He has set forth at large the doctrine of Election, as it is propounded in* SCRIPTURE.

Here, again, if I mistake not, this excellent man *assumes* the very point, which, ere he used it in argument, he ought, by competent evidence, to have *established.*

That he honestly sets forth his *own* view of what *he* deemed the true scriptural doctrine of *Election*, no one, who was acquainted with his character, will deny: but it does not of necessity follow, that HIS INTERPRETATION of the phraseology of Scripture is identical with THE REAL MIND of

Scripture. In the abstract, it may, or it may not: and, in the concrete, while many good men would assent to the Scheme advocated by Mr. Milner, Calvin *himself* has, by anticipation, roundly declared it to be unskilful and puerile*. But, correct or incorrect in itself, I submit, that *no* man, let him be Calvinist or Semicalvinist or Baxterocalvinist or Anticalvinist, has a right to designate HIS OWN PRIVATE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE by the imposing name of SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE, until, through some tangible evidence, he shall have morally demonstrated, that *his* interpretation is assuredly the *true* interpretation. No fallacy is more gross, though, unhappily for the cause of sober inquiry, no fallacy is more common, than to confound together, as if they were identical, AN APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE, and AN APPEAL TO A PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL'S OWN GRATUITOUS INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE. The two are in no wise, *of necessity*, indentical: though, in discussions of the present nature, they have often, more rapidly than logically, been *assumed* to be such †.

3. Mr. Milner recommends: that *Those, who cannot receive his doctrine of Semicalvinism, should pray, that God would teach them what at present they see not.*

In recommending such a petition for divine teaching in regard to the true import of litigated texts, I am fully aware, that he has the great authority of Augustine: for that eminent Father tells the Christians of Marseilles, that, if they unfortunately differ from him in the matter of Predestination, God, provided they walk piously in that faith

* Inscitè nimis et pueriliter. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 23. § 1.

† That clear-headed writer, Dr. Waterland, justly observes: *It is but shallow artifice constantly to call* INTERPRETATIONS *of Scripture*, SCRIPTURE. Case of Arian Subscrip. plea vi. Works, vol. ii. p. 300.

to which they have already attained, will, in due time, reveal it in answer to their prayers*.

But, high as the authority of Augustine is, and extensive as have been the ecclesiastical researches of Mr. Milner, I cannot think, that, in this their idea of the proper office of prayer, they are by any means correct.

(1.) *No* Christian, who has compared his own heart with the language of Scripture, will deny his need of the gracious illumination of the Blessed Spirit. But, from an attentive and cautious perusal of that same Scripture, *many* Christians will perhaps incline to think: that *That promised and necessary illumination is moral, not intellectual;* that *It respects, if I may use such phraseology, the self-examining religious understanding, not the externally-investigating critical understanding;* that *It teaches a man, thoroughly to know himself ab intra, not by any special illapse accurately to decide upon the truth or falsehood of a litigated doctrine ab extra.*

Its object is, I apprehend, to remove the moral darkness of our fallen nature, to communicate a thorough knowledge of our own utter weakness and corruption, to dispel the delusive dreams of our own innate sufficiency and goodness, to cast down all high imaginations, and to shew us practically and feelingly what we have become through sin that so we may thankfully and eagerly aspire after a better state through grace†.

* Retenta ergo ista, in quæ pervenerunt, plurimum eos a Pelagianorum errore discernunt. Proinde, si in eis ambulent et orent eum qui dat intellectum, si quid de Prædestinatione aliter sapiunt, ipse illis hoc quoque revelabit. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. i. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 485.

† The whole scriptural *rationalè* of *Fallen man, morally dark by nature, and morally illuminated by grace*, is briefly propounded by our Lord himself in his address to the Church of Laodicèa.

Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have

But, unless I greatly mistake, its object is *not* to convey to our intellect the alone true meaning of a difficult passage in Scripture; its object is *not* to enable us to determine, peremptorily and without appeal, what Scheme of Doctrine *must* be received, and what Scheme of Doctrine *must* be rejected

To settle the import of a litigated text, we must, simply and with full honesty of purpose and (I will add) with devout prayer for such *moral* tempers and dispositions, collect and weigh all the evidence which lies within our reach; not expect any peculiar illuminating descent of the Spirit into our minds, after the way of a communication to the *intellect*. It was, indeed, the office of the Holy Ghost to guide the Apostles into ALL truth: truth *intellectual*, as well as truth *moral**. But *they*, like the Prophets before them, were the specially inspired delegates of heaven: and, as the vehicle of God's message to man, it was plainly necessary, that all possibility of doctrinal error should, with *them*, be supernaturally precluded. *We*, however, are placed in a very different situation: *we* must look only for the ordinary or moral, not the extraordinary or intellectual, gifts and graces of the Spirit. God forbid, that any Christian man should deny the *moral* illumination of the Holy Ghost: but, to expect his *intellectual* illumination, in order that we may unerringly decide, whether the

need of nothing; and knowest not, that thou art wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich, and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve, that thou mayest see. Rev. iii. 17, 18.

The object, we see, of the illumination of the Spirit, is not to make men unerring doctrinal critics, but to teach them self-knowledge through a powerful application of Scripture to their consciences.

* John xvi. 13.

calvinistic view of Election, or any other view of Election, be correct or incorrect; and to make the grant of such *intellectual* illumination a subject of prayer to the throne of grace; *this*, I think, is a plain, and I fear, also a dangerous, mistake.

In effect, to pray for *intellectual* illumination, after the mode recommended by Augustine and Mr. Milner; to pray, that is to say, that God would reveal to us the certainty of a particular Scheme of exposition, which, with some varieties, they pronounce to set forth the undoubted mind of Scripture: *thus* to pray is neither more nor less, than to pray for the lofty prerogative of *Personal Infallibility* For, if God, in answer to prayer, ordinarily teaches the true meaning of a litigated passage in Scripture, the interpretation, thus by the Holy Spirit conveyed to the mind of the petitioner, must needs be *infallibly* accurate: and it were alike impious and presumptuous to question any further the soundness of the interpretation thus authoritatively propounded. Under such an aspect of the matter, which inevitably results from the plan before us, we might as reasonably question the message of an inspired Prophet or Apostle, as impugn the calvinistic or semicalvinistic exposition of the doctrine of *Predestination* when a pious man shall declare that he has made it a subject of prayer, and that he has risen from his knees internally convinced by the Spirit of the undoubted correctness of this System or of that System.

(2.) The grievously delusive unwarrantability, however, of preferring any such prayer, will readily and (as it were) practically appear, if we only consider the necessary, and indeed actually experienced, consequence of the practice.

Two persons, we will say, each with perfect though mistaken sincerity, supplicate the throne of grace, that the true interpretation of those texts, which speak of Election

and Predestination, may by the Holy Spirit be conveyed to their divinely illuminated intellect.

The prayer is, by each party, duly put up: and the incongruous result is: that *The one person becomes a decided Calvinist*, and that *The other person rises from his devotions a stedfast Arminian.*

Now, clearly, the interpretations, which they henceforth confidently recommend as answers severally vouchsafed to their prayers for intellectual illumination, cannot *both* be correct.

How, then, if we admit the fitness of the practice, are we to determine between the two opposing expositions? WHICH interpretation are we bound in conscience to receive as the unerring communication of the infallible Spirit of unmixed truth?

Without the very extremity of arrogant assumption, *neither* individual, I apprehend, can presume to say, that *his* interpretation is the genuine dictate of the Spirit, and that the interpretation of his *opponent* is advanced purely under the influence of a strong delusion.

I put not any mere imaginary case: the unseemly incongruity, here pointed out, has actually occurred, as the result of the unauthorised prayers of two very good, though very mistaken, men.

Mr. Whitfield says: *I never read any thing that Calvin wrote: my doctrines I had from Christ and his Apostles:* I WAS TAUGHT THEM OF GOD. And he further somewhat more distinctly states, in regard to the particular doctrine specially alluded to: *Election is a doctrine, which I thought, and do now believe,* WAS TAUGHT ME OF GOD*.

Yet Mr. Wesley broadly declares: that HE HAS AN IMME-

* Whitfield's Lett. 214. Gillie's Life of Whitfield, p. 68. cited in Nott's Bampton Lectures, p. 247, 248.

DIATE CALL FROM GOD *to preach and publish to the world, that Mr. Whitfield's doctrine is highly injurious to Christ**.

From the very purport of these jarring allegations, I venture to conclude, that Mr. Whitfield and Mr. Wesley had alike prayed to God for a right understanding of the texts which are litigated between Calvinists and Arminians: for neither of them could have well imagined, that *he was taught of God* or that *he had an immediate call from God*, without the antecedent preparation of much thought on the subject mingled with much prayer†. Yet, what is the result of such utterly unscriptural applications to the Deity? Combining the two together, we portentously learn, from the conjoined declarations of Mr. Whitfield and Mr. Wesley, that *the former* WAS TAUGHT OF GOD *the doctrine of Election as expounded by Augustine and Calvin*, while *the latter* HAD AN IMMEDIATE CALL FROM GOD *to publish to the whole world that this identical doctrine of Election thus expounded is totally false and highly injurious to Christ.*

The truth of the matter was, that each, by his own private reasoning and judging upon Scripture, had firmly persuaded himself, that his own view of Election was undoubtedly correct; and an erroneous estimate of the nature and office of prayer, associated with a strong imagination, readily effected the remainder.

* Gentleman's Magazine, vol. xl. p. 322. cited in Nott's Bampton Lect. p. 248.

† We may the more reasonably infer such to have been the case from Mr. Whitfield's own account of his claims and habits.

The Holy Spirit, from time to time, has led me into the knowledge of divine things: and I have been directed, by watching and reading the Scriptures on my knees, even in the minutest circumstances, as plainly as the Jews were, when consulting the Urim and Thummim at the High-Priest's breast. Account of God's Dealings, p. 34. cited in Nott's Bamp. Lect. p. 247.

But the mischief of such presumptuous petitions will appear in even a yet more striking point of view, when it is stated, that they have actually been preferred both by an Infidel and (in the language of the early Church) by a God-denying Apostate, and that the wretched result was a full confidence on the part of each that his own System had received the special sanction of heaven.

When Lord Herbert of Cherbury had finished his favourite infidel Work, he prayed, that he might be instructed by some sign from heaven, whether it were for the honour of God to suppress it or to publish it. The answer to his prayer, he tells us, was a divine sign which authorised him to print and to circulate the Work *.

The prayers of Socinus were, to himself at least, of an equally satisfactory description. He claimed to have received God's instruction and assistance in the interpretations which he has put upon the various passages of Scripture litigated between his own followers and the Church Catholic†.

I may add, that even the allied expositions of Augustine and Mr. Milner will but still further serve distinctly to shew the illegitimacy of the plan now under discussion.

Since these two divines recommended the practice to *others;* we may fairly presume, that, respecting the true scriptural System of Predestination, they *themselves* alike prayed for intellectual illumination. Yet, after all, in evolving the Schemes of their several intrepretations, they are not perfectly agreed. For, if I may be pardoned a phraseological anachronism, Augustine was a steady and unflinching

* Lord Herbert's Life, p. 172. Leland's View of Deistic Writers, vol. i. p. 25.

† Green on Enthusiasm, p. 44. cited in Nott's Bamp. Lect. p. 291.

Calvinist: while Mr. Milner, according to his own statement of his own views, does not adventure to be more than a *Semicalvinist.*

And now we may well stand aghast at the varied alleged answers to prayer for divine intellectual illumination: answers, which, if really received, would confer the privilege of Infallibility upon each jarring petitioner.

When these answers are all brought together, the result will be: that, *At different times, and through the instrumentality of different individuals, God has unerringly decided in favour, of Calvinism and of Arminianism, of Calvinism and of Semicalvinism, of Socinianism and of Infidelity.*

(3.) To put such a summary into express words, is in no wise agreeable to my feelings; for I would not willingly approach even to the confines of irreverence: but I have been compelled by the necessity of my argument.

The present delusive and unscriptural opinion I have thought it the more proper to notice somewhat at large, because I fear, that, with many truly good persons, it is in no wise uncommon. Indeed, I may say with truth, that I have myself heard it maintained and defended. The whole error springs from a want of accurately distinguishing, between ILLUMINATION MORAL, and ILLUMINATION INTELLECTUAL.

CHAPTER VI.

INDUCTION AND EVIDENCE.

THE peculiar Scheme of interpretation, familiarly denominated *Calvinism*, having now, at sufficient length, been stated: our next business must be to inquire, upon what foundation that Scheme has been erected.

I. In the enumeration of the five Points, *Original Sin*, which is noted as the third of them, cannot justly be laid down as a *speciality* of Calvinism. No doubt, it is *held* by the Calvinist: but then it is *also* held by every Anticalvinist, save those who have embraced the Pelagian and Socinian Heresies.

I conclude, therefore, that it is noted as the third of the five Points, not on the ground that it is a *special* doctrine of Calvinism, but purely in the way of *a necessary link of connection:* and I am the more led to this conclusion, because I observe, that the Synod of Dort has arranged it in the same section with the fourth Point or the doctrine of *Effectual Calling*, instead of giving it a distinct section to itself.

Thus viewing the third Point merely in the light of a necessary link of connection, I may observe: that, as a System, the several parts of which mutually depend upon each other, while the subordinate propositions all ultimately rest upon a primary proposition, nothing, provided only the primary proposition be well established, can be more perfectly harmonious and more beautifully compact, than genuine unadulterated Calvinism.

When I say *beautifully compact*, I, of course, speak, not

of its doctrinal beauty, but of its systematising beauty: for, whatever may be thought of the former, its sturdiest opponents, I suppose, will not deny to it an ample share of the latter.

Calvinism is strictly *A System of Induction from a single well-defined Principle:* and this Master-Principle is *The absolute or sovereign Election of a certain number of individuals, out of the great corrupt mass of mankind, through the medium of personal holiness here, to eternal happiness hereafter.*

Such is the Principle or the Primary Proposition: and, with the Principle at its head, the train of reasoning, deduced from it, runs, I believe, in manner following.

1. A certain definite number of individuals, which number can be neither increased nor diminished, are, by the mere sovereign will of God, out of the great corrupt mass of mankind, unconditionally ELECTED, through the medium of holiness here, to eternal glory hereafter.

2. This ABSOLUTE ELECTION of certain individuals being thus the fixed purpose of God, all those remaining individuals, who are *not* thus elected, *must*, of plain necessity, be *left* or *pretermitted* or *reprobated* (by whichever of these words we may choose to express the idea), without a possibility of escape, to perish everlastingly in that state of alienation from God which equally characterises all the fallen race of Adam: for ABSOLUTE REPROBATION is the inseparable correlative to ABSOLUTE ELECTION.

3. Now, since God never acts after a manner which must inevitably be nugatory, it is certain, that the REDEMPTION, effected by Christ, though in itself *sufficient* for the sins of the whole world, cannot, *designedly* and *effectively*, extend to those, who lie under an irreversible decree of Reprobation to eternal misery. Therefore, the Redemption, effected

by Christ, can only be THE PARTICULAR REDEMPTION OF THE ELECT.

4. But all mankind, the Elect as well as the Reprobate, are born in ORIGINAL SIN. Consequently, since the Elect are saved only through the medium of personal holiness and practical devotedness to God, they must, at some appointed time, receive, from the good Spirit of God, AN EFFECTUAL CALLING.

5. The Elect, however, are *irreversibly* elected to eternal glory. But, since they are also elected to eternal glory through the alone medium of personal holiness after they shall have been effectually called: they plainly, with whatever allowance for human infirmity, and with whatever occasional lapses into temporary sin, *must*, after their EFFECTUAL CALLING, persevere, *in the general disposition and practice of holiness*, to the end of their lives. Therefore, receiving the doctrine of IRREVERSIBLE ELECTION, we must also receive the doctrine of THE FINAL PERSEVERANCE OF THE ELECT*.

II. So far as I can perceive, this train of inductive reasoning, from a well-defined Principle, is altogether unobjectiona-

* I have been particularly careful in the selection of my words; because, by many ignorant and prejudiced persons, a very foul, but a very false, allegation, has occasionally, both before the time of the Synod of Dort and down also to the present day, been advanced against the Calvinistic System.

That System has been set forth: as offering a premium for gross immorality; as inculcating, in the case of the vainly presumptuous, an unhallowed security; and as advocating, to the certain ruin of the constitutionally despondent, all the wild recklessness of utter and uncontrouled desperation.

Hence, in the way of summary, we have been gravely assured: that, *According to the Calvinistic Scheme of Interpretation, the Elect, no matter what may be the obstinate ungodliness of their lives,* MUST *be finally saved even in their impenitence; while the Reprobate, no matter what*

ble. Grant *The doctrine of* ELECTION *as defined by Calvin:* and every other Point will follow of very necessity.

may be the devoted holiness of their conversation, MUST, *even in their godly penitence, be finally damned.*

Nothing can be more unfounded than the present vulgar allegation.

Calvinism really teaches: that *The Elect, even though they may be humbly doubtful of their own individual Election, will always, after their Effectual Calling, lead, however speckled with the remains of human corruption, holy and devoted and godly lives; while the Reprobate, even though they may madly and contemptuously presume upon their own imagined security, will always shew their true character, either by an indulgence in habitually unhallowed practice, or by an utter deadness to every sentiment of vitally influential religion.* See Judic. Synod. Dordrech. conclus. cap. v.

This invariable association of *Holiness* with *Election* and of *Unholiness* with *Reprobation* is assuredly, as we are informed by those who should best know their own sentiments, the special badge of Calvinism: and, for the abuse of the System by the profanely licentious, *that* Scheme, in common equity, is no more responsible, than any *other* Scheme can justly be made responsible for its own particular and disallowed perversion.

The dogma, if such a dogma be held even by the wildest Antinomian; that *An individual may fearlessly and securely sin, because, without evidence, or rather indeed against evidence, he has fondly persuaded himself that he is one of the Elect:* this dogma is a mere perversion of the Genevan System. A pious Calvinist (and, among doctrinal Calvinists, have been numbered some of the best and the wisest and the most holy men, that have ever adorned the Church Catholic) would shrink from it with horror and disgust. So far from sanctioning the blasphemous absurdity, he would, on the *real* principles of his own doctrinal Scheme, be the first and foremost to consider its maintenance, by any pretended Calvinist, as a black mark too surely indicative of the wretched individual perverter's own reprobation. *Whatever may be the secret ultimate purpose of God in regard to Effectual Calling*, he would say: *no man can claim to be of the number of the Elect to glory, unless, as a clear evidence of his Election, he can shew a life devoted to his Saviour and instinct with fruit-producing holiness.*

As honest men, we are bound, in the measure of our opportunity, faithfully to investigate doctrinal truth: but then, as honest men also, we are equally bound to abstain from the offensive shamelessness of unmerited calumny.

But here arises the important question of *Evidence.*

As the whole System rests upon the calvinistically defined doctrine of ELECTION: the whole System really depends upon the scriptural accuracy of a definition.

If Calvin has justly defined the scriptural term ELECTION; we stand bound, by the laws of right reasoning, to receive his whole System: if he has *not* justly defined that term; his whole System, being deprived of its foundation, falls immediately to the ground.

1. How, in matter of FACT, he *has* defined the term, we well *know.* But, where his AUTHORITY is for propounding such a definition, we are bound to *inquire*, before we can rationally or safely receive the definition itself.

If the definition rests merely upon his own private judgment: the whole Scheme, in that case, reposes upon no better foundation, than the simple naked *opinion* of a very able and very eminent individual who flourished in the sixteenth century.

The opinion *may* have satisfied Calvin, and *may* still satisfy his followers: nay, even, in the abstract, the opinion *may*, peradventure, itself, be well founded: but, after all, an *opinion*, without any evidence to demonstrate its truth, is nothing more than an *opinion.* When distinctly laid down, its validity or cogency will amount only to this: *The calvinistic definition of Election* MUST *be correct; because an individual* THINKS, *that it is correct.*

2. To allege, in the way of proof of correctness, *the phraseology of Scripture;* and to declare, that *Holy Scripture alone, or Holy Scripture independently of all other evidence, shall decide the controversy;* which I observe to be the plan avowedly laid down and insisted upon by the Synod of Dort: such an allegation and such a declaration constitute a mere *petitio principii*, a gross *begging of the*

*question**. For the matter, to be determined, is: not the *existence* of the phraseology, but its *import;* not whether

* I subjoin, as a logical curiosity, the precise words of the Synod.

Ista Arminii ejusque sectatorum dogmata, accuratè, et ex SOLO Dei verbo, dijudicarentur; vera doctrina stabiliretur; et falsa rejiceretur.—

Hæc itaque veneranda Synodus, in nomine Domini Dordrechti congregata, divini Numinis et salutis Ecclesiæ accensa amore, et post invocatum Dei nomen, sancto juramento obstricta, se SOLAM Scripturam Sacram pro judicii norma habituram, et in caussæ hujus cognitione et judicio bona integraque conscientia versaturam esse, hoc egit sedulo magnaque patientia, ut præcipuos horum dogmatum patronos, coram se citatos, induceret ad sententiam suam de Quinque Notis Doctrinæ Capitibus, sententiæque rationes, plenius exponendas. Judic. Synod. Dordrech. in Præfat.

I. The first Council of Nice, which sat in the year 325, when laying down its exposition of Scripture in regard to the proper divinity of Christ, confidently, as its voucher, appealed to Antiquity.

Accordingly, its allegation was: that *It taught no new and hitherto unheard of doctrines;* but that *It only propounded those, which had been held by the Catholic Church, from the very beginning, on the authoritative teaching of the Apostles.*

Here we have a distinct and intelligible *reason*, why we should receive the exposition of the Nicene Fathers.

II. But the Divines of Dort seem to have acted upon a very different principle.

A professed declaration, that they will admit *Holy Scripture* ALONE to decide the dispute between themselves and the Remonstrants, sounds, no doubt, in the ears of a superficial inquirer, very reasonable and very satisfactory and very protestant: but, when stripped of its decent plausibility, it really means nothing more, than an avowal, that *The* SOLE *judge should be Holy Scripture as gratuitously interpreted by themselves.*

Such a compendious plan would certainly make very quick work with controversy. Let the Divines of Dort, by their own mere authority, interpret Scripture as they please; and let them declare, that *An appeal to their own arbitrary interpretation* ALONE is identical with *An appeal to Scripture* ALONE: and the Remonstrants, or indeed any other class of Anticalvinists, are incontinently beaten out of the field.

Gravely to swear, that *The Synod will abide by the decision of Holy Scripture* ALONE; and then, no less gravely, without a shadow of evi-

Scripture *alone* is to be received as an authoritative Rule of Faith, but what System of doctrine is *really propounded* in Scripture.

We all know, that the WORD *Election* is scriptural. *This* we require not to be told. What, for a legitimate settlement of the question, we *want* to know, is the MEANING of the word as employed by the inspired writers.

So great is my veneration for the Bible, and so full is my assurance that it is the infallible word of God: that I hold myself prepared implicitly to believe *any* doctrine, which it propounds. But, as for *what* doctrine it propounds, I must have some tangible and intelligible evidence: and a mere gratuitous assertion thrown out by an individual, that *It contains such or such a doctrine*, is manifestly no proof to *me*, that it really *does* contain such or such a doctrine.

3. Calvin assures us, that *his* interpretation of the word *Election* is its *true* interpretation: and the theologians of Dort strenuously reëcho his assurance.

This may, or may not, be the case. But, without some

dence even *pretended* to be adduced in their favour, gratuitously to INTERPRET Holy Scripture according to their own fancy: is, surely, the very perfection of solemn mockery. They seem either to have quite forgotten or most unaccountably to have overlooked, that the true question, between themselves and the Remonstrants, was not *The* SOLE AUTHORITY *of the Bible as a binding Rule of Faith*, but *The* CORRECT INTERPRETATION *of the phraseology of the Bible as the sense to be received.*

But it will be said, that, instead of depending upon their own unaided judgment alone, they did not proceed to give sentence until after they had solemnly invoked the name of God to guide them to a true decision.

Here they doubtless followed the advice of their great original master Augustine. But the delusiveness of prayer for *intellectual* illumination, in order that we may rightly interpret disputed texts of Scripture, has already been abundantly exposed.

distinct *evidence* of the correctness of Calvin's interpretation, we have clearly nothing better than a mere *opinion*.

Unless a tangible *proof* be adduced, the whole System, resting as it does upon an *exposition*, will inevitably rest upon an *assumption*. Independently of such proof, Calvin could only have said: *My interpretation is true, because I myself believe it to be true.* To which, still independently of proof on either side, an opponent, with equal cogency, might readily have answered: *Your interpretation is false, because I myself believe it to be false.*

4. The same remark obviously applies to every Calvinist of the present day.

If he can give no better reason for his interpretation of Scripture, than *his own private individual persuasion of its accuracy:* however he may succeed in persuading *himself;* on no intelligible principle, can he reasonably hope to persuade *another*.

CHAPTER VII.

AUGUSTINE.

If the System, denominated *Calvinism*, do indeed faithfully exhibit the mind of Scripture, it propounds a Scheme of doctrine far too marked and too prominent and too important not to have been well and familiarly known to the Catholic Church from the very beginning.

I mean not to say, that it must have appeared in all the strict formality of a precise and minutely defined set of Articles: for scholastic exactness of *this* description is produced only by controversy. But *thus far* I will certainly say, that if the Calvinistic System were the System universally understood, by the primitive Christians, to have been delivered by the inspired Apostles, as the undoubted and indisputable sense of the phraseology employed in the writings of the New Testament: we *must* find it, boldly and characteristically prominent, though of course only under a hortatory or practical form, in all the early ecclesiastical documents.

To suppose otherwise, were to suppose, that the Church in her best and purest day, the Church with the very voice of the Apostles still sounding in her ears, either deliberately suppressed, or contemptuously disregarded, a revealed Scheme of doctrine, which could not but be highly important even under the simple aspect of its *being* a revelation, and which must be viewed as yet *additionally* and indeed *pre-eminently* important if (as its advocates contend) it be the very pith and marrow of scriptural sincerity.

I. On the reasonable principle that *A System ought to bear the name of its author*, the term *Calvinism* is certainly improper.

We cannot justly charge the Genevan Reformer with inventive innovation. He did not, in the sixteenth century, rashly, for the first time, propound any new-fangled results of his own unchastened and unwarranted private judgment. Both within the pale of the Latin Church, and among those who from time to time protested against her growing corruptions, we find, through a long succession of ages, the same general Scheme of doctrine repeatedly advanced and maintained and defended.

II. On this fact of perhaps well nigh unbroken evidence, it is superfluous for me to dwell: I rather hasten to that great man, from whose mighty authority such speculations pervaded the West, while they appear to have made scanty progress in the East.

Calvin, as he does, may justly claim, as his own, Augustine of Hippo. For, to draw any essential distinction between Calvinism and Austinism would argue small acquaintance with the writings of either divine.

1. Respecting what are called *The Five Points*, Augustine and Calvin fully and perfectly symbolised: though, by neither of them, are those Five Points drawn out in that regular form of Articles, which has been adopted by the Synod of Dort.

(1.) As the vindicatory basis of his whole Scheme, Augustine laid down two postulates: *The Original Sin of man, derived from the Fall of Adam;* and *The just, though irresponsible, Sovereignty of God.*

From these premises, he argued: that *An Absolute Election of certain individuals to eternal life, though resulting*

purely from the divine will and pleasure, is not, on the part of the Supreme Ruler, abstractedly unjust.

For, since, both by Original Sin and by Actual Sin, ALL are transgressors of God's Law: it were, assuredly, no injustice, if ALL were left to perish.

Therefore, if ALL might justly be left to perish: clearly no breach of justice can be committed, in the free Election of SOME to eternal life*.

* *Sed cur*, inquit, *gratia Dei non secundum merita hominum datur?* Respondeo: *Quoniam Deus misericors est.* *Cur ergo*, inquit, *non omnibus?* Et hic respondeo: *Quoniam Deus judex justus est: ac per hoc et gratis ab eo datur gratia: et juste ejus in aliis judicio demonstratur, quid eis, quibus datur, conferat gratia.* Non itaque sumus ingrati, quod, secundum placitum voluntatis suæ, in laudem gloriæ gratiæ suæ, tam multos liberat misericors Deus de tam debita perditione: ut, si inde neminem liberaret, non esset injustus. Ex uno quippe omnes in condemnationem non injustam judicati sunt ire, sed justam. Qui ergo liberatur, gratiam diligat: qui non liberatur, debitum agnoscat.—

Quantum ad justitiam spectat et gratiam, potest et de reo qui liberatur rectè dici; *Volo:* potest et de eo qui damnatur: *Tolle quod tuum est et vade, huic autem volo quod non debetur donare.*—

Hic ille si dicat; *Cur non et mihi?* merito audiet; *O homo, tu qui es qui respondeas Deo? Quem certè in uno vestrum benignissimum largitorem, in te vero exactorem justissimum, in nullo tamen cernis injustum. Cum enim justus esset, etiamsi utrumque puniret: qui liberatur, habet unde gratias agat; qui damnatur, non habet quod reprehendat.*

Hominibus autem videtur, omnes, qui boni apparent fideles, perseverantiam usque in finem accipere debuisse. Deus autem melius esse judicavit, misereri quosdam non perseveraturos certo numero sanctorum suorum: ut, quibus non expedit in hujus vitæ tentatione securitas, non possint esse securi: multos enim a perniciosa elatione reprimit quod ait Apostolus: *Quapropter, qui videtur stare, videat ne cadat.* Voluntate autem sua cadit, qui cadit: et voluntate Dei stat, qui stat.—

Si duobus itaque parvulis originali peccato pariter obstrictis, cur iste assumatur, ille relinquatur: et, ex duobus ætate jam grandibus impiis, cur iste ita vocetur ut vocantem sequatur, ille autem aut non vocetur aut non ita vocetur, inscrutabilia sunt judicia Dei. Ex duobus autem

(2.) The ground being thus cleared from probable or possible objection, Augustine thought himself at liberty to teach the doctrine of *Absolute Predestination* in both its branches.

Accordingly, on the one hand, he maintained: that, *Although, in the present state, we cannot certainly know the Elect from the Reprobate; for, as the Reprobate may seem for a time to be leading holy lives, so the Elect, anterior to their Effectual Calling, may for a time also appear to be in no wise characterised by godliness: yet a definite number of individuals, as well from among the members of the visible Church as from the great mass of the unbelieving world at large, are, by the mere sovereign pleasure of God, personally elected to eternal salvation*.*

piis, cur huic donetur perseverantia usque in finem, illi autem non donetur, inscrutabilia sunt judicia Dei. Illud tamen fidelibus debet esse certissimum, hunc esse ex prædestinatis, illum non esse. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. ii. c. 8, 9. Oper. vol. vii. p. 497.

The same basis of *God's just Sovereignty and man's universal corruption* is taken by the Synod of Dort.

Cum omnes homines in Adamo peccaverint, et rei sint facti maledictionis et mortis æternæ: Deus nemini fecisset injuriam, si universum genus humanum in peccato et maledictione relinquere, ac propter peccatum damnare, voluisset. Judic. Synod. Dordrech. c. i. § 1.

* Erant in bono: sed, quia in eo non permanserunt, id est, non usque in finem perseveraverunt, *non erant*, inquit, ex nobis, *et quando erant nobiscum;* hoc est, non erant ex numero filiorum, et quando erant in fide filiorum: quoniam, qui verè filii sunt, præsciti et prædestinati sunt *conformes imaginis Filii ejus*, et secundum propositum vocati ut electi essent. Non enim perit filius promissionis, sed filius perditionis. Fuerunt ergo isti ex multitudine vocatorum: ex electorum autem paucitate non fueruut.—Ipsi sunt illi prædestinati et secundum propositum vocati, quorum nullus perit. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 9. Oper. vol. vii. p. 475.

Quamvis ergo ita se habeat de prædestinatione definita sententia voluntatis Dei, ut alii ex infidelitate, accepta voluntate obediendi, convertantur ad fidem, vel perseverant in fide: cæteri vero, qui in peccatorum damnabilium delectatione remorantur, et si ipsi prædestinati sunt, ideo

R. J. LIBRARY K. C. K. BAPTIST SEMINARY

Whence, consistently, on the other hand, without any reserve or verbal palliation, he asserted: that, *Since the number of the Elect can be neither diminished nor increased, all the rest of mankind, equally by the mere sovereign pleasure of God, being ultimately given over to the unrestrained exercise of their evil Free-Will, are personally reprobated to eternal damnation**.

nondum surrexerunt, quia nondum eos adjutorium gratiæ miserantis erexit. Si qui enim nondum sunt vocati, quos gratia sua prædestinavit eligendos, accipient eandem gratiam, qua electi velint esse et sint. Si qui autem obediunt, sed in regnum ejus et gloriam prædestinati non sunt, temporales sunt, neque usque in finem in eadem obedientia permanebunt. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. ii. c. 22. Oper. vol. vii. p. 505.

Proinde, quantum ad nos pertinet, qui prædestinatos a non prædestinatis discernere non valemus, et ob hoc omnes salvos fieri velle debemus. August, de Corrept. et Grat. c. 16. Oper. vol. vii. p. 480.

* Numerus ergo sanctorum, per Dei gratiam Dei regno prædestinatus, donata sibi etiam usque in finem perseverantia, illuc integer perducetur, et illic integerrimus jam sine fine Certissimus servabitur, adhærente sibi misericordia Salvatoris sui.—Hi vero, qui non pertinent ad istum certissimum et felicissimum numerum, pro meritis justissimè judicantur: aut enim jacent sub peccato quod originaliter de generatione traxerunt, et cum illo hæreditario debito hinc exeunt quod non est regeneratione dimissum; aut per liberum arbitrium alia insuper addiderunt, arbitrium, inquam, liberum, sed non liberatum;—aut gratiam Dei suscipiunt, sed temporales sunt, nec perseverant, deserunt, et deseruntur. Dimissi enim sunt libero arbitrio, non accepto perseverantiæ dono, judicio Dei justo et occulto. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 13. Oper. vol. vii. p. 479.

Hæc prædestinatio sanctorum nihil aliud est, quam præscientia scilicet et præparatio beneficiorum Dei, quibus certissimè liberantur, quicunque liberantur. Cæteri autem ubi, nisi in massa perditionis, justo divino judicio, relinquuntur? August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. ii. c. 14. Oper. vol. vii. p. 500.

Hæc de his loquor, qui prædestinati sunt in regnum Dei, quorum ita certus est numerus, ut nec addatur eis quisquam, nec minuatur ex eis. —Ipsi autem vocati dici possunt, non autem electi, quia non secundum

(3.) Such being Augustine's avowed theological principles, though he may not perhaps have used the precise technical phrase, he advocated, in effect, the doctrine of *Particular Redemption.*

For he taught: that, *When it is said, that God will have all men to be saved, though in point of fact all men are not saved; this language relates exclusively to the Elect, who, through God's sovereign pleasure, are, out of all classes of men, predestinated to eternal life*.*

(4.) Thus holding the doctrine of *Absolute Election to life from all eternity,* he held also the doctrine of *The Effectual Calling of the Elect in time.*

Hence he taught: that, *In due season, God works by his Spirit in the hearts of the Elect*†.

And hence he maintained: that, *While, to the Reprobate, reproof acts only as a penal torment; to the Elect, that same reproof is instrumentally blessed as a salutary medicine*‡.

propositum vocati. Certum vero esse numerum electorum, neque augendum neque minuendum. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 13. Oper. vol. vii. p. 478.

* Et quod scriptum est, quod *Vult omnes homines salvos fieri*, nec tamen omnes salvi fiunt, multis quidem modis intelligi potest, ex quibus in aliis opusculis nostris aliquos commemoravimus: sed hic unum dico. Ita dictum est, *Omnes homines vult salvos fieri*, ut intelligantur omnes prædestinati, quia omne genus hominum in eis est. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 14. Oper. vol. vii. p. 479.

† Per Spiritum Sanctum operatur in cordibus electorum suorum bona, qui operatus est ut ipsa corda essent ex malis bona. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 21. Oper. vol. vii. p. 467.

Ex his nullus perit, quia omnes electi sunt: electi sunt autem, quia secundum propositum vocati sunt; propositum autem, non suum, sed Dei.—Quicunque enim electi, sine dubio etiam vocati; non autem quicunque vocati, consequenter electi. Illi ergo electi, ut sæpe dictum est, qui secundum propositum vocati, qui etiam prædestinati atque præsciti. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 7. Oper. vol. vii. p. 473.

‡ Ut, si is, qui corripitur, ad prædestinatorum numerum pertinet, sit

(5.) On the same principle, he harmoniously taught the doctrine of *The Final Perseverance of the Elect through the indefectible grace of God.*

According to the necessity of his theory, *none of the Elect can perish everlastingly:* for, as from his own premises he justly argued, those, who have been elected to a *certainty* of eternal life, cannot but, *as* such, persevere to the end. Those persons, consequently, who, after even some continuance in apparent holiness, fall away and perish, never were included in the number of the Elect. For, though the Reprobate, to all outward appearance, may live well for a season: yet, not having, like the Elect, the gift of Final Perseverance, they invariably, at length, fall away to perdition*.

2. On one particular only, in short, with respect to any matters bearing upon the Theological System which they

ei correptio salubre medicamentum: si autem non pertinet, sit correptio pœnale tormentum. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 14. Oper. vol. vii. p. 479.

* Quis in æternam vitam potuit ordinari, nisi perseverantiæ dono? August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 6. Oper. vol. vii. p. 473.

Horum si quisquam perit, fallitur Deus: sed nemo eorum perit, quia non fallitur Deus. Horum si quisquam perit, vitio humano vincitur Deus: sed nemo eorum perit, qui nulla re vincitur Deus. Electi autem sunt ad regendum cum Christo. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 7. Oper. vol. vii. p. 473.

Nunc vero sanctis, in regnum Dei prædestinatis, non tantum tale adjutorium perseverantiæ datur; sed tale, ut eis perseverantia ipsa donetur: non solum ut, sine isto dono, perseverantes esse non possint; verum etiam, ut, per hoc donum, non nisi perseverantes sint. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 12. Oper. vol. vii. p. 477.

Ipse ergo eos facit perseverare in bono, qui facit bonos. Qui autem cadunt et pereunt, in prædestinatorum numero non fuerunt.—Ipse itaque dat perseverantiam, qui statuere potens est eos qui stant ut perseverantissimè stent, vel restituere qui ceciderint. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 12. Oper. vol. vii. p. 478.

alike adopted, is there a semblance of discrepancy between Calvin and Augustine.

The particular, to which I refer, is the doctrine of *Regeneration.*

Calvin held: that *The grace of Regeneration is granted* SOLELY *to the Elect.* And, consequently, he held: that *The Regenerate* CANNOT *finally fall away to perdition*.*

Augustine held: that ALL *infants are regenerated in Baptism.* And, consequently, since persons baptised in their infancy may perish everlastingly, he likewise held: that *The Regenerate* MAY *finally fall away to perdition*†.

This difference, however, is apparent, not real: verbal, not actual.

The SENSE, which Calvin universally attached to the term *Regeneration*, Augustine did *not* attach to that term when he associated Regeneration with Infant-Baptism.

Calvin invariably deemed Regeneration *A Moral Change*

* Nihil erit ambiguum, si tenemus, quod debet ex superioribus liquere, duplicem esse vocationis speciem.—Illa impiorum etiam communis est: hæc secum affert Spiritum regenerationis, qui est arrhabo et sigillum futuræ hæreditatis, quo in diem Domini obsignantur corda nostra. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 24. § 8.

† Mirandum est quidem, multumque mirandum, quod filiis suis Deus quibusdam, quos regeneravit in Christo; quibus fidem, spem, dilectionem, dedit; non dat perseverantiam, cum filiisalienis scelera tanta dimittat, atque, impertita gratia sua, faciat filios suos. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 8. Oper. vol. vii. p. 474.

Quos ignibus æternis præscivit arsuros, creare non desinit: nec ei, quia eos creat, nisi bonitas imputatur. Et quosdam infantes etiam baptizatos, quos futuros præscivit apostatas, non aufert ex hac vita in æternum regnum adoptatos, nec eis confert magnum beneficium. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. v. c. 10. Oper. vol. vii. p. 379.

De nullo mortuo baptizato poterit esse securitas, quia, et post baptismum, non qualitercunque peccare, verum etiam apostatare, homines possunt. August. de Anim. lib. i. c. 12. Oper. vol. vii. p. 429.

of Disposition superadded to A Federal Change of Condition: and he evidently viewed it, as taking place in the Elect, and in the Elect only, at the time of their Effectual Calling*.

But Augustine, in the case of infants, viewed Regeneration, not as *A Moral Change of Disposition united to A Federal Change of Condition*, but as *A beneficial Federal Change of Relative Condition* ONLY: for, in the infant subject, he viewed it, as only removing the *Reatus* or *Imputed Guilt* of Original Sin, and as only bringing him, from out of the wilderness of the unbelieving world, into the pale and covenanted privileges of Christ's Church†.

* Hæc (vocatio) secum affert Spiritum regenerationis. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 24. § 8.

Interior igitur hæc vocatio pignus est salutis quod fallere non potest. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 24. §. 2. Vide etiam Confess. Belg. § xxxv. Syllog. Confess. p. 350.

Quos enim nominis sui cognitione illuminatos in Ecclesiæ suæ sinum Christus asciscit, eos dicitur in fidem tutelamque suam recipere. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 24. § 6.

† Restat, ut in nostra natura tanquam vulnus aliquod fateamur esse sanandum, cujus reatum jam fatemur regeneratione sanatum. August. cont. Julian. lib. v. c. 16. Oper. vol. vii. p. 383.

Quid conferat gratia, cum reatum ejus absolvit, quo faciebat originaliter hominem reum, quando fit in illa plena remissio peccatorum; quamvis ipsa remaneat, contra quam regenerati spiritus concupiscat?—Inest enim sensus hujus mali, dum reluctatur atque cohibetur. Reatus autem ille, qui sola regeneratione dimittitur, quemadmodum, cum inesset, non sentiebatur, ita ejus ablatio fide creditur, non carne vel mente sentitur. August. cont. Julian. lib. vi. c. 6. Oper. vol. vii. p. 385, 386.

Per hoc, non solum peccata omnia, quorum nunc remissio fit in baptismo, quæ reos faciunt, dum desideriis vitiosis consentitur atque peccatur; verum etiam ipsa desideria vitiosa, quibus si non consentitur, nullus peccati reatus contrahitur, quæ non in ista sed in alia vita nulla erunt, eodem lavacro baptismatis universa purgantur. Reatus itaque vitii ejus, de quo loquimur, in regeneratorum prole carnali tamdiu manebit, donec et illic lavacro regenerationis abluatur. August. cont. Pelag. et Celest. de Peccat. Original. lib. ii. c. 40. Oper. vol. vii. p. 305.

Ipsa ista carnis concupiscentia in baptismo sic dimittitur, ut, quan-

Yet, since, in his opinion, and in necessary accordance with *his* train of reasoning when he discusses the topic, Regeneration, in the case of infants, neither is, nor can be, *A Moral Change of Disposition;* he thence contended: that, *Although* ALL *baptised infants must be accounted regenerate; still, in order to their salvation, they must, at some time* AFTER *their Baptism, experience that Moral Change of Disposition, which* HITHERTO *they have* NOT *experienced.*

Now this subsequent *Moral Change of Disposition*, which, at some period or another, all, who are finally saved, *must* experience, Augustine styled *Conversion:* and, since, in *his* view of the matter, infants do *not* experience this *Moral Change of Disposition* in their baptismal Regeneration, and yet since it is itself essential to eternal salvation; he of course maintained, that, in *his* occasional sense of the word, *The Regenerate may fall away irretrievably, and thus finally perish*.*

quam tracta sit a nascentibus, nihil noceat renascentibus. Augus. cont. duas Epist. Pelag. ad Bonifac. lib. i. c. 13. Oper. vol. vii. p. 404.

* Veraciter conjicere possumus, quid valeat in parvulis baptismi sacramentum, ex circumcisione carnis, quam prior populus accepit; quam priusquam acciperet, justificatus est Abraham.—Cur ei præceptum est, et omnem deinceps infantem masculum octavo die circumcideret, *qui nondum potuerat corde credere ut ei deputaretur ad justitiam;* nisi quia et ipsum, per seipsum, sacramentum multum valebat?—Sicut in Isaac, qui octavo suæ nativitatis die circumcisus est, præcessit signaculum justitiæ fidei; et, quoniam patris fidem imitatus est, secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia, cujus signaculum in infante præcesserat: ita et, in baptizatis infantibus, præcedit *regenerationis sacramentum;* et, si christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam *in corde conversio*, cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore.—Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur, aliud esse *sacramentum baptismi*, aliud *conversionem cordis;* sed salutem hominis *ex utroque* compleri: nec, si *unum* horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse, ut et *alterum* desit; quia et *illud* sine *isto* potest esse in infante, et *hoc* sine *illo* potuit esse in latrone, complente Deo, sive in illo sive in isto, quod non ex voluntate defuisset, cum vero ex voluntate alte-

Such, in the matter of Regeneration, was the apparent difference between Calvin and Augustine: a difference, as I have already observed, purely verbal, and in no wise actual.

For nothing, I think, is more evident: than that, what Augustine, in the case of baptised infants, styles *Conversion*, is precisely that *Moral Change of Disposition* which Calvin, universally and in all cases, denominates *Regeneration;* and that this *Conversion* (in the phraseology of Augustine) and this *Regeneration* (in the phraseology of Calvin), being strictly identical, are, by those two Divines, alike viewed, as taking place at the time of the Effectual Calling of the Elect.

The final result of our examination, therefore, is: that, *Even in the particular of Regeneration, there is, between Calvin and Augustine, no real discrepance*.*

rum horum defuerit, reatu hominem involvi. Et *baptismus* quidem potest inesse, ubi *conversio cordis* defuerit: *conversio* autem *cordis* potest quidem inesse, non percepto *baptismo;* sed, contempto, non potest. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24, 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52, 53.

* With respect to bare verbal phraseology, the nomenclature of Calvin, in possessing the completeness of entire uniformity, has certainly a decided advantage over the incongruously varying nomenclature of Augustine.

Calvin, in *every* case, uses the term *Regeneration* in only *one* sense: that of *A Moral Change of Disposition associated with A Federal Change of Condition.*

Augustine, on the contrary, according as he applies the term, to the adult recipients of baptism on the one hand, or to the infant recipients of baptism on the other hand, uses it in *two* senses: that of *A Moral Change of Disposition* ASSOCIATED WITH *A Federal Change of Condition*, and that of *A Federal Change of Condition* ONLY.

Hence, when Augustine applies the term to the case of infant recipients, employing it *then* to denote *A Federal Change of Condition* ONLY, he of course makes Baptism and Regeneration inseparable.

But, when he applies it to the case of adult recipients, employing it

3. Whether Augustine agreed, or disagreed, with Calvin, on the nice point of *Supralapsarianism*, we have, so far as I am aware, no explicit evidence.

then, like Calvin, to denote *A Moral Change of Disposition* ASSOCIATED WITH *A Federal Change of Condition*, he makes Baptism and Regeneration separable: for, with Jerome and Cyril of Jerusalem, contending that the moral grace of inward spiritual Regeneration accompanies outward Baptism *only* when the adult recipient is worthy; he thence, with them also, declares expressly, that *The outward sign may be administered* WITHOUT *the concomitancy of the inward grace*, adding conversely (as in the instance of the penitent thief on the cross), that *The inward grace may be granted* WITHOUT *the concomitancy of the outward sign.*

Cum essent omnia communia sacramenta, non communis erat omnibus gratia quæ sacramentorum virtus est. Sicut et nunc, jam revelata fide quæ tunc velabatur, omnibus in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizatis commune est lavacrum regenerationis: sed ipsa gratia, cujus ipsa sunt sacramenta, qua membra corporis Christi cum suo capite regenerata sunt, *non* communis est omnibus. Nam et hæretici habent eundem baptismum, et falsi fratres in communione catholici nominis. August. Enarr. in Psalm. lxxvii. Oper. vol. viii. p. 306.

Hæc itaque in omnibus generat, cujus sacramenta retinentur, unde possit tale aliquid ubicunque generari: quamvis non omnes, quos generat, ad ejus pertineant unitatem, quæ usque in finem perseverantes salvat. Neque enim hi soli ad eam non pertinent, qui separationis aperto sacrilegio manifesti sunt; sed etiam illi, qui in ejus unitate corporaliter mixti per vitam pessimam separantur. Etenim Simonem magum, per baptisma pepererat: cui tamen dictum est, quod *non haberet partem in hæreditate Christi*. Nunquid ei baptismus, nunquid evangelium, nunquid sacramenta, defuerunt? Sed, quia ei charitas defuit, frustra natus est. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 10. Oper. vol. vii. p. 33.

Horum autem omnium generum, illi primi, qui sic sunt in domo Dei ut ipsi sint domus Dei, sive jam spiritales sint, sive adhuc parvuli lacte nutriantur; sed tamen ad spiritalem habitum intento corde proficiant: nemo dubitat, quin baptismum et utiliter habeant, et se imitantibus utiliter tradent. Fictis autem, quos Spiritus Sanctus fugit, etsi ipsi, quantum in eis est, utiliter tradunt, illi tamen inutiliter accipiunt, non imitantes eos per quos accipiunt. Illi vero, qui *sic sunt in magna domo tanquam vasa in contumeliam*, et inutiliter habent baptismum, et se imi-

I do not recollect, that the Bishop of Hippo ever touches upon the distinction between *Supralapsarianism* and *Sublapsarianism.*

tantibus inutiliter tradunt. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. vii. c. 52. Oper. vol. vii. p. 74.

Si quis hoc corporeum, et quod oculis carnis inspicitur, aquæ tantum accepit lavacrum, *non* est indutus Dominum Jesum Christum. Nam et Simon ille, de Actibus Apostolorum, acceperat lavacrum aquæ : verum, quia Sanctum Spiritum non habebat, indutus *non* erat Christum. Et hæretici vel hypocritæ, et hi qui sordidè victitant, videntur quidem accipere baptismum : sed nescio an Christi habeant indumentum. Hieron Comment in Galat. iii. 27. Oper. vol. vi. p. 137.

Ἡ πρόθεσις γνησία οὖσα κλητὸν σε ποιεῖ· κἂν γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ὧδε ἔχῃς, τὴν δὲ διάνοιαν μὴ ἔχῃς, οὐδὲν ὠφελῇ. Προσῆλθε ποτε καὶ Σίμων τῷ λουτρῷ ὁ μάγος· ἐβαπτίσθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη. Καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἔβαψεν ὕδατι· τὴν δὲ καρδίαν οὐκ ἐφώτισε Πνεύματι. Καὶ κατέβη μὲν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἀνέβη· ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ οὐ συνετάφη Χριστῷ, οὐδὲ συνηγέρθη. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω τὰς ὑπογραφὰς τῶν πτωμάτων, ἵνα μὴ σὺ ἐμπέσῃς. Cyril. Hieros. Proëm. in Catech. p. 1, 2.

Εἰ δὲ ἐπιμένῃς κακῇ προαίρεσει, ὁ μὲν λέγων ἀναίτιος, σὺ δὲ μὴ προσδόκα λήψεσθαι τὴν χάριν. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὕδωρ σε δὲ δέξεται· τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα οὐ δέξεται. Cyril. Proëm. in Catech. p. 3.

Οὐδὲ τῷ ὕδατι βαπτιζόμενος, μὴ καταξιωθεὶς δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τελείαν ἔχει τὴν χάριν· οὐδὲ κἂν ἐνάρετος τις γένηται τοῖς ἔργοις, μὴ λάβῃ δὲ τὴν δι' ὕδατος σφραγίδα, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Cyril. Catech. iii. p. 16.

Οἷς γὰρ ἔτι τὸ τραχὺ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν περίκειται, οὗτοι ἐν τοῖς ἀριστεροῖς τυγχάνουσι, διὰ τὸ μὴ προσελθεῖν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτι τῇ δοθείσῃ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ λουτροῦ ἀναγεννήσει· ἀναγέννησιν δὲ οὐ σωμάτων λέγω, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς τὴν πνευματικὴν ἀναγέννησιν. Cyril. Catech. i. p. 2.

Illud (sacramentum baptismi) sine *isto* (conversione cordis) potest esse in infante, et *hoc* sine *illo* potuit esse in latrone, complente Deo, sive in *illo* sive in *isto*, quod non ex voluntate defuisset ; cum vero ex voluntate alterum horum defuerit, reatu hominem involvi. Et *baptismus* quidem potest inesse, ubi *conversio cordis* defuerit : *conversio* autem *cordis* potest quidem inesse, non percepto *baptismo ;* sed, contempto, non po-

Calvin, as we have seen, unreservedly professes his adherence to the higher modification.

test. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 53.

This doctrine of the early Church, which, in the case of adults, makes the conveyance of the inward spiritual grace of baptism to depend upon the sincerity and worthiness of the recipient, seems (in opposition, I suppose, to the *opus operatum* of Popery) to have been adopted by the Reformers of the Church of England.

In such only as worthily receive the sacraments, they have a wholesome effect or operation. Art. xxv.

Augustine, as we have seen, contends; that, in the case of infants, *Regeneration* UNIVERSALLY *accompanies Baptism:* but then, in *their* case, he confines the sense of Regeneration to *A Federal Change of Condition;* maintaining, that the inward spiritual grace, which he styles *Conversion of heart*, must be looked for at some *subsequent* period. And this opinion he holds so rigidly, that, unless I wholly misunderstand him, he denies altogether the very possibility of the occurrence of ANY *Moral Change of Disposition* in the baptism of an infant: that is to say, in Calvin's sense of the word *Regeneration*, he asserts, that *Infants never are, and never can be, spiritually regenerated in Baptism.*

Infants, he argues, can neither believe from the heart to righteousness, nor confess from the mouth to salvation. Therefore infants are INCAPABLE of any *Moral Change of Disposition.* Consequently, since they CANNOT experience a *Moral Change of Disposition* at their baptism, their INEVITABLE want of this indispensable *Moral Change* must hereafter be supplied by a spiritual *Conversion of heart.* August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24, 25. See the last note.

Such a round denial of the very POSSIBILITY of a *Moral Change in the Disposition of infants*, on the ground that *Infants can neither believe nor confess*, goes, I apprehend, far beyond Calvin himself: for, though, with Augustine, he fixes what *he* calls *Regeneration* and what Augustine styles *Conversion*, to the time of the Effectual Calling of the Elect; he never, so far as I know, denies that an infant *may* be effectually called from the day of his baptism, and thence never denies that an infant *may* be spiritually regenerated in baptism.

In truth, this speculation of Augustine strikes me, as being alike unwarrantable and inconsistent.

If infants, *as* infants, be capable of *The Moral Taint of Original Sin;* a scriptural doctrine, which Augustine rightly and strongly main-

tains: there is no very intelligible reason, why, still *as* infants, they should not *also* be capable of a *Moral Regeneration to Holiness.* An admission of the former possibility requires and involves an admission of the latter possibility: nor, on the just principle of homogeneity, can I see, why the argument of Augustine, from the acknowledged circumstance of *The physical inability of infants to believe from the heart to righteousness and to confess from the mouth to salvation*, should forbid our admission, that an infant is capable of being *morally*, as well as *federally*, regenerated at the time of his baptism.

Any such moral regeneration would of course be, as the schoolmen speak, *according to the measure of the recipient.* But, why a moral regeneration may not commence at the baptism of an infant, and why the only regeneration of which an infant can be deemed capable is a Federal Change of Condition, I have not sufficient acuteness to understand.

That, on this point, I have mistaken Augustine, I can scarcely think: for he expressly argues, that *Divine Grace may hereafter supply the involuntary moral defectiveness* INHERENT *in infant baptism.*

Eadem gratia Omnipotentis implere credenda est, quod, non ex impia voluntate, sed EX ÆTATIS INDIGENTIA, nec corde credere ad justitiam POSSUNT, nec ore confiteri ad salutem. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE HISTORICAL VINDICATION OF HIS SYSTEM, PREFERRED BY AUGUSTINE, AND REPEATED BY CALVIN.

For those doctrinal peculiarities, which, collectively as a System, are now generally denominated *Calvinism*, the Genevan Reformer may undoubtedly claim the authority of Augustine: and thence he may very fairly throw off from himself the weighty responsibility of rash and unwarranted innovation.

But Augustine wrote on *Predestination* in the early part of the fifth century, or somewhat more than three hundred years after the death of St. John, the last survivor of all the Apostles.

Hence the important question arises: *Whether Augustine himself was a daring innovator; or whether he propounded nothing else, than what had been the universally familiar doctrine of the Church from the very beginning.*

I. With respect to this question, simple chronology alone shews us: that, *Antecedent to the time of Augustine's formal exposition of his Doctrinal System, we have at least three whole centuries to account for.*

Therefore, unless we can satisfactorily fill up those three centuries, it is quite clear: that, *Even if the peculiarities before us rest not indeed upon the insulated private judgment of Calvin, they will still rest solely upon the insulated private judgment of Augustine.*

Consequently, in that supposed case, save only with the

exchange of the sixteenth century for the fifth, an interpretation of Scripture, propounded for the first time by the mere private judgment of an insulated individual, will equally be the exclusive basis of the Doctrinal System which is now submitted to the test of historical discussion.

Augustine, however, conscious of the vast evidential importance of Primitive Antiquity, vindicates his System on the score: that *He himself set forth no new Scheme of Doctrine;* but, on the contrary, that *He faithfully delivered to posterity what had been actually received from priority.*

Our business, therefore, is, carefully to examine a vindication thus specially constructed.

1. During some considerable time at the beginning of the fifth century, Augustine had been usefully employed in conducting a dispute, relative to *Divine Grace* and *Human Nature*, with Pelagius and Celestius and Julian and their followers.

Now, as he himself states even in one of those later controversial Works which more fully develop and defend his peculiarities, the whole question, between the Pelagians and the Catholics, *really* turned upon three points.

The first point, asserted by the Church, was: that *The Grace of God is not given according to man's antecedent merits.*

The second point, asserted by the Church, was: that, *Whatever may be the comparative righteousness of any one particular man, no person lives in this corruptible body without incurring the actual guilt of a certain degree of positive sinfulness.*

The third point, asserted by the Church, was: that *We are all born obnoxious to the sin of the first man; and, consequently, are all subjected to damnation, unless the guilt,*

which is contracted in our generation, be removed by our regeneration.*

These three several points were *denied* by the Pelagians: and these three several points, with the full approbation of the entire Catholic Church, were manfully *asserted* by Augustine.

Nor did he vindicate the affirmative of the question, either merely by his own private interpretation of Scripture, or merely by a triumphant appeal to what might have been nothing better than the fashionable theology of his ecclesiastical contemporaries.

On the contrary, he boldly stated; that *The Catholic Church had* ALWAYS *held the allied doctrines of Original Sin and Unmerited Grace:* while his pelagian opponents, men but of yesterday, notoriously denied *Original Sin;* maintained, that *We sin only by vicious imitation;* and asserted, that *Grace is given according to Antecedent Merit.*

Such was his statement: and, in order to demonstrate that *Antiquity was his voucher*, he successively called forward as his witnesses, a few only out of many, Irenèus of Lyons who through the single medium of Polycarp had received his theology from the apostolic authority of St. John, Cyprian of Carthage, Reticius of Autun, Olympius

* Tria sunt, ut scitis, quæ maximè adversus eos Catholica defendit Ecclesia.

Quorum est unum: Gratiam Dei non secundum merita nostra dari; quoniam Dei dona sunt, et Dei gratia etiam conferuntur merita universa justorum.

Alterum est: In quantacunque justitia, sine qualibuscunque peccatis, in hoc corruptibili corpore, neminem vivere.

Tertium est: Obnoxium nasci hominem peccato primi hominis, et vinculo damnationis obstrictum; nisi reatus, qui generatione contrahitur, regeneratione solvatur. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. ii. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 495.

of Spain, Hilary of Poictiers, and the great Ambrose of Milan*.

More witnesses, to the same purpose, he might easily have produced: but these, as he himself justly says, he deemed sufficient. In truth, the testimony of Irenèus alone was quite competent to settle the matter.

2. Thus far, in regard to the vital points of doctrine now before us, there was abundant cause for the full approbation and entire acquiescence of the faithful: but, as the dispute advanced, Augustine was at length induced to put forth his Treatise on *Correction and Grace.*

Here, what *before* he had but briefly and (as it were) almost imperceptibly touched upon, he formally drew out into that System, which has since, by general modern consent, received the name of *Calvinism*†.

* Non quidem omnium de hac re sententias, nec omnes eorum quos commemorabo, me congregaturum esse polliceor; quia nimis longum est, et necesse esse non arbitror: sed ponam pauca paucorum, quibus tamen nostri contradictores cogantur erubescere et cedere, si ullus in eis, vel Dei timor, vel hominum pudor, tantum malum pervicaciæ superaverit. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. i. c. 3. Oper. vol. vii. p. 326.

Una est enim omnium catholica fides, qui, per unum hominem peccatum intrâsse in mundum in quo omnes peccaverunt, uno corde credunt, uno ore fatentur, et vestras novitias præsumptiones catholica antiquitate subvertunt. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. i. c. 3. Oper. vol. vii. p. 326. Vide etiam August. cont. duas Epist. Pelag. ad Bonifac. lib. iv. c. 8–12. Oper. vol. vii. p. 422–425.

† For Augustine's earlier brief introduction of his peculiarities, see August. de Peccat. Merit. et Remiss. lib. ii. c. 27. Oper. vol. vii. p. 270. August. de Nat. et Grat. c. 5. Oper. vol. vii. p. 278. August. de Grat. et Orig. Pecc. lib. i. c. 12. lib. ii. c. 31. Oper. vol. vii. p. 293, 304. August. de Nupt. et Concupis. lib. ii. c. 3, 16, 18, 29. Oper. vol. vii. p. 315, 319, 320, 323. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. v. c. 3, 4. lib. vi. c. 10. Oper. vol. vii. p. 373, 374, 389. August. cont. duas Epist. Pelagian. ad Bonifac. lib. i. c. 20, 24. lib. ii. c. 7, 10. Oper.

When *this* most unequivocal Treatise reached Gaul, and indeed in some measure even when his *former* Treatises had reached it, Augustine's declared opinions, respecting Predestination and its subordinates, were warmly opposed.

Whereupon, Prosper of Aquitaine and Hilary of Arles, the former of whom had espoused the peculiar sentiments of the Bishop of Hippo, wrote to him on the subject: and their Epistles are of no small consequence, because they distinctly state the *professed ground* of the opposition.

From those Epistles we learn: that many of *The Servants of Christ*, who lived in Marseilles and in other parts of Gaul (I borrow the description of their character as given in the words of Prosper himself), expostulated with Augustine, through the communicative medium of Prosper and Hilary, to the following effect.

We heartily approve of your general confutation of Pelagius and his followers. But why do you superfluously mingle with it a System of Novel Peculiarities, which we cannot receive? To say nothing of what we, at least, deem the utter inconsistency of that System with Scripture: it is, in truth, quite new to us. We never even so much as heard of it before: we find it unsanctioned by any one of the preceding Fathers: and we perceive it to be contrary to the sense of the whole Catholic Church. Be assured, however, that, THIS ONE MATTER EXCEPTED, *we cordially admire your holiness, both in* ALL *your doings and in* ALL *your sayings**.

vol. vii. p. 405, 406, 409, 410, 411. August. de Anim. lib. i. c. 8. lib. iv. c. 11. Oper. vol. vii. p. 428, 445. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 7, 18, 20. Oper. vol. vii. p. 462, 466.

In one of these places, he enters, even at some length, upon the correlative topics of *Election* and *Reprobation*. See August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. v. c. 4. Oper. vol. vii. p. 374.

* Multi ergo servorum Christi, qui in Massiliensi urbe consistunt, in

Now here, be it observed, there is a broad allegation of A NAKED FACT. Plainly, therefore, the sole question is: *Whether the allegation was well founded or ill founded.*

We see the case brought within the narrowest possible limits: and, except through the channel of *A satisfactory Nullification of the alleged* FACT *by the adduction of competent opposing historical testimony*, it is certain and indisputable, that no legitimate answer could be preferred by Augustine.

3. The letters of Prosper and Hilary, which notified to Augustine this unreserved allegation of A FACT, called forth from him yet another Treatise: the Treatise, namely, res-

sanctitatis tuæ scriptis, quæ adversus Pelagianos hæreticos condidisti, *contrarium putant Patrum opinioni et ecclesiastico sensui, quicquid in eis de vocatione electorum secundum Dei propositum disputâsti.*—Atque, ut brevius ac plenius, quod opinantur, exponam: quicquid in libro hoc, ex contradicentium sensu, sanctitas tua sibi opposuit; quicquid etiam in libris contra Julianum, ab ipso sub hac quæstione objectum, potentissimè debellâsti: hoc totum ab ipsis sanctis intentiosissimè conclamatur. Et, cum contra eos scripta beatitudinis tuæ, validissimis et innumeris testimoniis divinarum Scripturarum instructa, proferimus; ac, secundum formam disputationum tuarum, aliquid etiam ipsi, quo concludantur, astruimus: *obstinationem suam vetustate defendunt; et ea, quæ de Epistola Apostoli Pauli Romanis scribentis, ad manifestationem divinæ gratiæ prævenientis electorum merita proferuntur, a nullo unquam Ecclesiasticorum ita esse intellecta, ut nunc sentiuntur, affirmant.* Prosper. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 481, 482.

Hæc sunt itaque, quæ Massiliæ, vel aliis etiam locis in Gallia, ventilantur. *Novum et inutile esse prædicationi, quod quidam secundum propositum eligendi dicantur.—Quid opus fuit hujus-cemodi disputationis incerto tot minus intelligentium corda turbari? Neque enim minus utiliter, sine hac definitione,* aiunt, *tot annis a tot tractoribus, tot præcedentibus libris et tuis et aliorum, cum contra alios, tum maximè contra Pelagianos, catholicam fidem fuisse defensam.*—Sed planè illud tacere non debeo, quod se dicant tuam sanctitatem, HOC EXCEPTO, in factis et dictis OMNIBUS admirari. Hilar. Arelat. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 483, 484.

pecting *The Predestination of the Saints and the Gift of Perseverance.*

In this Treatise, after again going over his ground at considerable length, he finally, toward the conclusion, attempts to meet the FACT so confidently and so unequivocally alleged against him.

How, then, we naturally ask, *does* he meet it?

He meets it in manner following.

With respect to the Church, he admits: that *She was not wont to bring forward, in preaching, the doctrine of Predestination; because, formerly, there were no adversaries to answer.* But he claims to establish: that, *Notwithstanding her habitual silence on the topic, she* MUST *always have held the doctrine in question; because she has always prayed, that unbelievers may be converted to the faith, and that believers may persevere to the end*.*

* Atque utinam tardi corde et infirmi, qui non possunt, vel nondum possunt, Scripturas vel earum expositiones intelligere, sic audirent vel non audirent in hac quæstione disputationes nostras, ut magis intuerentur orationes suas, quas semper habuit, et habebit Ecclesia, ab exordiis suis, donec finiatur hoc sæculum.

De hac enim re, quam nunc adversus novos hæreticos, non commemorare tantum, sed planè tueri et defendere, compellimur; nunquam tacuit in precibus suis, et si aliquando in sermonibus exerendam, nullo urgente adversario, non putavit.

Quando enim non oratum est in Ecclesia, pro infidelibus atque inimicis ejus, ut crederent? Quando fidelis quisquam, amicum, proximum, conjugem, habuit infidelem: et non ei petivit a Domino mentem obedientem et christianam fidem? Quis autem sibi unquam non oravit, ut in Domino permaneret? Aut quis, sacerdotem, super fideles Dominum invocantem, si quando dixit, *Da illis, Domine, in te perseverare usque in finem*, non solum voce ausus est sed saltem cogitatione reprehendere, ac non potius super ejus talem benedictionem, et corde credente et ore confitente, respondit, *Amen:* cum aliud in ipsa oratione dominica non orant fideles, dicentes maxime illud, *Ne nos inferas in tentationem;* nisi ut in sancta obedientia persevérent?—

Hæc igitur, quæ poscit a Domino, et semper, ex quo esse cœpit, poscit

With respect to the more ancient Fathers his predecessors, he adduces, out of their whole number, precisely *three:* Cyprian, Gregory-Nazianzen, and Ambrose. And, on the strength of certain very brief citations from their writings, he pronounces: that *These all harmoniously teach his own System of Predestination**.

Ecclesia; ista Deus vocatis suis daturum se esse præscivit, ut in ipsa Prædestinatione jam dederit.—

Quæ bona si semper oravit, semper ea Dei dona esse utique credidit: nec, ab illo esse præcognita, unquam ei negare fas fuit. Ac, per hoc, Prædestinationis hujus fidem, quæ contra novos hæreticos nova solicitudine nunc defenditur, nunquam Ecclesia Christi non habuit. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. ii. c. 23. Oper. vol. vii. p. 506.

* Hoc scio neminem, contra istam prædestinationem, quam secundum Scripturas Sanctas defendimus, nisi errando, disputare posse.—

1. Quid autem amplius de hac re agere Cyprianus, martyr gloriosissimus et doctor lucidissimus, potuit, quam ubi nos, in oratione dominica, *Etiam pro inimicis fidei christianæ orare oportere*, commonuit: ubi, de initio fidei, quod *Etiam hoc donum Dei sit*, quid sentiret, ostendit: et, pro perseverantia usque in finem, quia et *Ipsam non nisi Deus eis, qui perseveraverint, donat*, Ecclesiam Christi quotidie orare monstravit.

2. Beatus quoque Ambrosius, cum exponeret quod ait Lucas Evangelista, *Visum est et mihi:*

Potest, inquit, *non soli visum esse, quod sibi visum esse declarat; non enim voluntate tantum humana visum est, sed sicunt placuit ei qui in me loquitur Christus, qui, ut id, quod bonum est, nobis quoque videri bonum possit, operatur: quem enim miseratur, et vocat. Et ideo, qui Christum sequitur, potest interrogatus*, Cur esse voluerit Christianus, *respondere:* Visum est et mihi. *Quod cum dicit, non negat Deo visum; a Deo enim præparatur voluntas hominum. Ut enim Deus honorificetur sanctè, Dei gratia est.*

Itemque, in eodem opere, hoc est in Expositione ejusdem Evangelii, cum ad illum venisset locum, ubi Dominum ad Hierusalem pergentem Samaritani recipere noluerunt:

Simul disce, inquit, *quia recipi noluit ab iis quos sciebat non simplici mente conversos. Nam, si voluisset, ex indevotis fecisset devotos. Cur autem non receperint eum, Evangelista ipse monstrat, dicens;* Quia facies ejus erat euntis in Hierusalem: *discipuli autem recipi intra Samariam*

I shall consider the several points of his evidence in regular order.

(1.) In regard to the asserted theology of the Church Catholic from the first predication of the Gospel down to his own time, the reasoning of Augustine, if I rightly understand him, is this.

The Church, confessedly, in the case of *some* persons, has

gestiebant. Sed Deus, quos dignatur, vocat: et, quem vult, religiosum facit.

Quid evidentius, quid illustrius, a verbi Dei tractatoribus quærimus, si et ab ipsis, quod in Scripturis clarum est, audire delectat?

3. Sed his duobus, qui sufficere debuerunt, sanctum Gregorium addamus et tertium: qui, et credere in Deum, et quod credimus confiteri, Dei donum esse, testatur, dicens:

Unius Deitatis, quæso, vos confitemini Trinitatem. Si vero aliter vultis, dicite unius esse naturæ: et Deus vocem dari vobis, a Spiritu Sancto, deprecabitur; id est rogabitur Deus, ut permittat vobis dari vocem, qua, quod creditis, confiteri possitis. Dabit enim, certus sum. Qui dedit quod primum est, dabit et quod secundum. Quia dedit credere, dabit et confiteri.

Istí tales tantique doctores, dicentes; Non esse aliquid, de quo tanquam de nostro, quod Deus non dederit, gloriemur; nec ipsum cor nostrum et cogitationes nostras in potestate nostra esse; et totum dantes Deo; atque ab ipso nos accipere confitentes, ut permansuri convertamur ad Deum; ut id, quod bonum est, nobis quoque videatur bonum, et velimus illud, ut honoremus Deum et recipiamus Christum; ut, ex indevotis, efficiamur devoti et religiosi; ut in ipsam Trinitatem credamus, et confiteamur etiam voce quod credimus: hæc utique gratiæ Dei tribuunt; Dei munera agnoscunt; ab ipso nobis, non a nobis, esse testantur.

Nunquid autem quisquam eos dicturus est, ita confessos istam Dei gratiam, ut auderent negare ejus præscientiam: quam non solum docti, sed indocti etiam, confitentur?

Porro, si hæc ita Deum noverant dare, ut non ignorarent eum daturum se esse præscisse, et quibus daturus esset non potuisse nescire: procul dubio noverant Prædestinationem, quam per Apostolos prædicatam, contra novos hæreticos, operosius diligentiusque defendimus. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. ii. c. 19. Oper. vol. vii. p. 503, 504.

always held the doctrine of *Final Perseverance.* THEREFORE, since she has always held the doctrine of *Final Perseverance;* she MUST likewise have always held the fundamental doctrine of *Predestination, as understood and explained by Augustine:* because, upon the doctrine of *Predestination thus understood and explained,* the doctrine of *The Final Perseverance of the Elect* is avowedly and necessarily constructed.

This argument, if argument it can be called, is built upon the gross sophism: that, Because *Augustine's doctrine of Predestination* inevitably draws after it the dependent doctrine of *The Final Perseverance of the Elect;* THEREFORE the doctrine of *The Final Perseverance of some believers* (without which Christianity itself would be nugatory) implies and involves, as its necessary foundation, *Augustine's doctrine of Predestination.*

Doubtless, the Church holds, and has always held, the doctrine of *The Final Perseverance of* SOME *individuals:* and, verily, it were passing strange, if she did *not* hold it; for, if *none* persevered to the end, it is abundantly clear, that *none* could be saved.

But, how the *thus* holding the doctrine of *A Final Perseverance of* SOME *persons* is to prove; that she also holds and has always held *Augustine's doctrine of the Absolute Election of* A FIXED NUMBER *of persons to assured salvation with his correlative doctrine of The Absolute Reprobation of* ALL OTHER *persons to assured perdition:* it certainly is not very easy to comprehend.

In truth, from Augustine's premises, the natural conclusion would be the precise opposite to that which he himself has drawn from them: the natural conclusion would be, that *The Church did* NOT *hold, and likewise never* HAD *held, the peculiar sentiments of Augustine on the points of Election*

and Reprobation. For, when she prays, that her believing members may persevere to the end; by the necessary import of such a prayer she virtually teaches, that, *In answer to the supplications of the Church, the grace of Final Perseverance* MAY *be granted to* ANY ONE *of her believing members:* whereas Augustine maintained; that *The number of the Elect can be neither* INCREASED *nor* DIMINISHED, and that *Final Perseverance is* EXCLUSIVELY *the consequence of Election.*

Augustine, in short, fully demonstrates against the Pelagians: that *The Catholic Church always held the doctrines of Grace.* But this, surely, is no proof of what he was challenged to prove: namely, that *The Catholic Church had always held his own peculiar sentiments of Election and Reprobation.*

(2.) From Augustine's argument in regard to the theology of the Church, we may proceed to his allegation respecting the three earlier Fathers whom he professes to adduce in testimony.

These three more ancient authors than himself are, as we have seen, Cyprian and Gregory-Nazianzen and Ambrose.

Now, as for the writers thus adduced, even had they all been full to his purpose, still I see not what would have been the special *argumentative* emolument of their adduction.

Cyprian, the *earliest* of the three, flourished about the middle of the third century: and the two others lived during the latter part of the fourth century, thus belonging to the ecclesiastical generation which immediately preceded Augustine himself.

Hence, even *had* their testimony been altogether satisfactory, we should still have had only a meagre list of three witnesses, the very earliest of whom lived no less than a whole century and a half after the death of St. John: and, yet, these witnesses, thus chronologically circumstanced, we

should have been required to admit, as giving a satisfactory account of the established doctrine of the Church, during the whole three hundred years which elapsed between the death of St. John and the prosecution of the Pelagian Controversy, or rather during the full three hundred and seventy years which elapsed between the first preaching of the Gospel and the prosecution of the same Pelagian Dispute.

But, in truth, of Augustine's three witnesses, Cyprian and Gregory-Nazianzen are so utterly irrelevant and so entirely wide of the mark, that the only wonder is, how they should *ever* have been adduced: while Ambrose, in at least one of the citations which have been made from him, is not a whit more apposite or pertinent.

Cyprian, it seems, prayed with the Church Catholic: that *Infidels might be converted;* and that *Believers might persevere to the end.* THEREFORE (such is the conclusion drawn by the Bishop of Hippo, as he similarly draws the same conclusion, in regard to the Church at large, from the similar constant practice of the Church) Cyprian *must* have held Augustine's sentiments respecting Election and Reprobation.

Gregory, exhorting his flock to confess the Trinity in Unity, stated: that *He, who gave them, in the first instance, to believe that doctrine; would also give them, in the second instance, to confess it.* THEREFORE (such, again, is the conclusion) Augustine's views of Election and Reprobation *must* clearly have been entertained by Gregory.

Ambrose argued: that, *When a man became a Christian, he might fairly allege his own good pleasure in so doing, without in any wise denying the good pleasure of God; for it is from God, that the will of man is prepared; and Christ calls him, whom he pities.* THEREFORE (thus, once more, runs the conclusion) Ambrose and Augustine *must* have

perfectly symbolised in their views of Election and Reprobation.

Another passage, however, has been alleged by Augustine from Ambrose, which, doubtless, until the real sentiments of the latter, as they stand forth in his own writings, shall have been exhibited, is apparently somewhat more promising.

Ambrose, commenting upon a remark made incidentally by St. Luke, expresses himself in manner following.

Learn also, that Christ would not be received by those, whom he knew to have not been converted in simplicity of mind. For, if he had so pleased, he might, from being undevout, have made them devout. But, why they did not receive him, the Evangelist himself shews us, when he says: Because his face was of one going to Jerusalem. *For the disciples were wishing to be received into Samaria. God calleth those, whom he deigns to call: and him, whom he willeth, he makes religious.*

On this insulated passage, associated with that which I have already noticed as being perfectly inapposite and impertinent, rests Augustine's entire proof: that *Ambrose fully agreed with him in his peculiar views of Election and Reprobation.* For let it not be forgotten: that the challenge of the Massilian Christians to Augustine was, not *to demonstrate by evidence the primitive antiquity of the doctrines of Grace,* but *to demonstrate by evidence the primitive antiquity of his own well defined specialities.*

Now, even in the place before us, nakedly standing as it does, I know not, that Ambrose says any thing, to which a sound maintainer of the vital doctrines of *Free Divine Grace* and *Corrupt Human Insufficiency* would not readily subscribe. A Calvinist or an Austinist, no doubt, would *of course* assent. But it by no means THEREFORE follows:

that every one, who *does* assent, stands *thereby* pledged to be a Calvinist or an Austinist.

The propriety of this remark, which obviously involves the evidential irrelevancy of the present citation, will soon appear, if, quitting our insulated and doctrinally indefinite passage, we simply and briefly compare the System of Augustine with the *real* sentiments of Ambrose, as, from his own writings, those sentiments may be readily collected.

Augustine taught *The* ABSOLUTE *Election of certain individuals to eternal salvation.* In other words, Augustine taught: that *God has irrevocably elected certain individuals to eternal salvation, simply* BECAUSE *such a proceedure seemed good to his sovereign will and pleasure**.

Ambrose taught *The* CONDITIONAL *Election of the Gentiles into the pale of the visible Church.* In other words, Ambrose taught: that *God has elected certain individuals, out of the great mass of the unbelieving Gentiles, into the pale of the visible Church,* BECAUSE *he foresaw the future merits and fitness of those individuals.* Whence he consistently maintained: that *The character of An Elect Race, a Royal Priesthood, a Holy Nation, an Adopted People, belongs in common to* ALL *the members of the visible Church Catholic*†.

Such were the respective Systems of Augustine and Am-

* See above, book i. chap. 7. § II. 1.

† Non sunt, qui *repudiantur* a Christo. Sunt autem, qui *eliguntur* a Domino: quoniam Dominus vocat quæ non sunt, tanquam quæ sunt. Et *electæ sunt gentium nationes*, ut destrueretur perfidia Judæorum. Ambros. Enarr. in Psalm. xliii. Oper. p. 1380.

In prædestinatione fuisse semper *Ecclesiam Dei.* Ambros. de Abraham. patriarch. lib. ii. c. 10. Oper. p. 1027.

Ad *omnes* jam dictum sit: *Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus in adoptionem.* Ambros. de fug. sæcul. c. 2. Oper. p. 198.

Quos præscivit, et prædestinavit. Non enim ante prædestinavit, quam

brose. No two Theological Schemes, I apprehend, whether in point of IDEALITY or in point of CAUSATION, can well be

præsciret: sed, quorum merita præscivit, eorum præmia prædestinavit. Ambros. de Fid. lib. v. c. 2.

It may be said: that there is at least *one* passage, in which Ambrose unreservedly and unambiguously speaks the very language of Augustine.

Si vero quæritur, *Cur Salvator omnium hominum non omnibus dederit hunc sensum, ut cognoscerent verum Deum, et essent, id est, permanerent, in vero Filio ejus:* quamvis credamus nullis hominibus spem gratiæ in totum fuisse subtractum; tamen ita forte hoc velatum sit, sicut illud absconditum est, *Cur antea, omnibus gentibus prætermissis, unum populum sibi, quem ad veritatis cognitionem erudiret, exceperit:* de quo judicio Dei si non est conquerendum, multo minus de hoc, quod cum electione omnium gentium geritur, murmurandum est.—

Nullis etenim studiis, nullis ingeniis, indagare concessum est, *Quo judicio, quove consilio, Deus, incommutabiliter bonus, incommutabiliter justus, semper præscius, semper omnipotens, ideo omnia in incredulitate concluserit, ut omnium misereatur; et tamen, illis seculis, quibus unum Israelem erudiebat, innumerabiles populos impiorum illuminare distulerit, et nunc eundem Israelem, donec universitas gentium introeat, obcæcatum esse patitur, pereuntem in tot millibus nascentium atque morientium, et salvandum in eis quos mundi finis invenerit.*

Quo mysterio toto Scripturarum corpore dilatato, innotuit quidem nobis, *Quid factum sit, Quid fiat, Quidve faciendum sit:* sed, *Quia ita fieri placuerit*, ab humanæ intelligentiæ contemplatione subtractum est.

Isti autem, qui nescire aliquid erubescunt et per occasionem obscuritatis tendunt laqueos deceptionis, omnem discretionem, qua Deus alios eligit, aliosque non elegit (multi enim sunt vocati, pauci autem electi), ad merita humanæ referunt voluntatis: docentes scilicet; *Neminem gratis, sed ex retributione, salvari; quia naturaliter omnibus sit insitum, ut, si velint, possint veritatis esse participes, eisque affluere gratiam a quibus fuerit expetita.*—

Frustra profunditatem inscrutabilis gratiæ per liberum arbitrium conantur aperire, qui CAUSAM Electionis in eorum constituunt meritis qui eliguntur. Ambros. de Vocat. gent. lib. i. c. 7. Oper. p. 244, 245.

This passage, in the main at least, so agrees with the views of Augustine, that we should marvel, why that Father, when challenged on the score of innovation, did not adduce it in evidence; unless we knew,

more different: and I must say, that Augustine's adduction of Ambrose, as an authority for his own peculiar view of *Election*, is, if we be charitably willing to exempt him from the charge of intentional disingenuousness, at the least, strangely nugatory and irrelevant.

4. Yet, though, so far as *authority* is concerned, the *peculiarities* of Augustine rest solely upon the *authority* of Augustine; because, his pretended witnesses from antiquity being thus swept away, his System, evidently, and (as it were) confessedly, originated altogether from *himself* while zealously engaged in the Pelagian Controversy, and is therefore no older than the beginning of the fifth century: still, after his death, it was warmly defended by Prosper, who had unreservedly adopted it as setting forth the genuine sense of Holy Scripture.

On this, an appeal was made to the judgment of Pope Celestine: and that Prelate, in giving his opinion, rightly approved of Augustine's insisting upon the doctrine of *Grace* against the Pelagians; but he cautiously refrained from noticing his two Treatises, the one on *Correction and Grace*, the other on *The Predestination of the Saints and the Gift of Perseverance*.

The matter being thus in effect left undecided, it was finally, by Pope Leo the great (who, after the death of Sixtus the immediate successor of Celestine, became, in the year 440, Bishop of Rome), referred to a Council, which, in the year 441, sat at Orange, in order that, through the ma-

that the Treatise on *The Calling of the Gentiles* was never written by Ambrose. I mean not to admit, that it would have *strictly* served the purposes of Augustine: for, in truth, it cannot wholly divest itself of the better Theology of an earlier age: but still, had it existed, when Augustine wrote, it might doubtless have been plausibly cited. It belongs, however, to a later age: and it was most probably the work of Prosper, that zealous disciple of Augustine; though some ascribe it to Pope Leo.

ture deliberation of that Assembly, it might be fully examined and duly settled*.

Now what was the decision of that Council: a decision, not delivered with the unconvincing offensiveness of prejudiced dogmatism, but built professedly and reasonably on the ground of Scripture, as Scripture, according to plain historical testimony, was understood and interpreted by Ecclesiastical Antiquity?

The members of the Council of Orange, as any person at all conversant with the early writings of the Church might well anticipate, justly condemn Pelagius: and, with much excellence of sound judgment, distinctly state and vindicate the doctrines of *Grace*. But, in all their twenty-five canons, they never once touch upon the peculiarities of Augustine as specially propounded in his two last Treatises; save only that, in their concluding canon, they define: that *All baptised Christians may, through grace, if they will only labour faithfully, accomplish those things which appertain to salvation;* and that *The doctrine of God's Predestination of some certain individuals to evil is, not only to be disbelieved, but also to be anathematised with all detestation*†.

Augustine, it will be remembered, when challenged by the Massilian Christians, ventured, on no very satisfactory inductive grounds, to allege the Church Catholic from the beginning, as holding and teaching his own peculiarities, though this practice of the Church was so unaccountably imperceptible that it had quite escaped the notice and knowledge of those Christians.

Now the Church, thus appealed to, puts forth twenty-five

* Præfat. in August. de Prædest. et Persever. Oper. vol. vii. p. 481.

† Concil. Arausican. can. xxv. in append. ad Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 21. See this canon, with all the other canons of that Council, cited at large below in the Appendix.

canons; in which, on the professed basis (be it observed) of *Scripture as understood and interpreted by Antiquity*, she gives, as her standard of historically accredited doctrine, an exact definition of the points which she maintains in opposition to the Heresy of Pelagius: but, throughout the whole of them, she never once mentions Augustine, though his peculiar speculations, associated with his opposition to Pelagianism, were the very reason of the convoking of the Council of Orange; and, throughout the whole of them, she never once recognises those speculations, as forming any part of the articles of faith which she had received from Priority and which she was bound conscientiously to deliver to Posterity.

Nothing, I think, can be a more decisive, though tacit, condemnation of the peculiarities of Augustine, than this *Studied Preterition.* The Church, when appealed to, refused to make those peculiarities her own: and, inasmuch as she laid down, what she *did* lay down, on the professed basis of *Scripture as understood and interpreted by Antiquity;* her silence on the peculiarities of Augustine, with the exception of her maintaining *The Salvability of all baptised Christians* and of her rejecting *The dogma of Reprobation* (if she alludes to *that* dogma under the name of *Predestination to evil;* for certainly it is possible, that she *may* refer to *The Predestinarian Fatalism of the Manichèans*), clearly shews, that she did not consider such to be the basis of those peculiarities, and consequently that she deemed them mere private unauthorised innovations. Augustine's eminent character, and the great services which he had rendered to the cause of evangelical truth by maintaining the doctrines of *Grace* against Pelagius, seems to have withheld the Council of Orange from an express and nominal condemnation of his peculiarities: but a most significant silence, while the members of that Council were professedly exhibiting the

received and accredited tenets of the Catholic Church, indicates abundantly, that those peculiarities were not acknowledged to form any part of the Creed which had been handed down to her from Christian Antiquity.

II. Calvin, who followed his great master Augustine after an interval of eleven centuries, was manifestly quite sensible of the vast importance of Antiquity in the due and legitimate settlement of *Doctrinal Truth*. Yet, as an historical voucher for the universal primitive inculcation of his opinions, he *himself*, in his own person, ventures not to appeal to any Father more ancient than Augustine*.

With respect to Augustine's *own* appeal to the testimony of three of his predecessors, Calvin, clearly enough perceiving the utter irrelevancy of Cyprian and Gregory-Nazianzen, totally pretermits them: but, upon the alleged evidence of Ambrose, he dwells, I am sorry to say, with more complacency than fairness.

Let the testimony of Augustine, says he, *avail with those, who willingly acquiesce in the authority of the Fathers: although, indeed, Augustine does not suffer himself to be disjoined from the rest; but, by clear testimonies, shews, that any such discrepance from them, as that with the odium of which the Pelagians attempted to load him, is altogether false. For, out of Ambrose, he cites:* Christ calls him, whom he pities. *And also:* If he had pleased, he might, from undevout, have made them devout: but God calls those, whom he deigns to call; and him, whom he wills, he makes religious. *This likewise he cites from the same author*†.

I have rarely met with a more artful misrepresentation of

* See Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 22. § 8. c. 23. § 1, 5, 7, 11, 13. c. 24. § 1, 17.

† Valeat Augustini testimonium apud eos, qui libenter in Patrum auctoritate acquiescunt: quanquam non patitur Augustinus se a reliquis disjungi; sed, claris testimoniis, divortium hoc, cujus invidia gravabant

the truth, than that which is contained in the present passage. To complete (as it were) the disingenuousness of Augustine, who, as we have seen, represents Ambrose as holding opinions which he did *not* hold: Calvin has hazarded two inaccurate statements of his own.

1. If any persons, he tells us, build upon the authority of the Fathers, let them know, that *Augustine does not suffer himself to be disjoined from the rest.*

Now what idea must such language as this inevitably convey to the mind of a reader, who confidently builds upon Calvin's supposed scrupulous accuracy, and who thence had not *himself* for his own complete satisfaction examined antiquity?

Doubtless a reader of this description will conclude: that ALL ANTIQUITY, *quite up to the apostolic age, spoke the language and advocated the peculiarities of Augustine.*

Whereas, in truth, Calvin himself being judge, the *only* writer, that Augustine with any decent shew of plausibility could produce, was Ambrose, who flourished not till the latter part of the fourth century: and, of this very Ambrose, the sentiments of Augustine, respecting Election and Reprobation, were, all the while, *not* the sentiments.

2. So again, while he intimates that Augustine by clear testimonies demonstrated the falsehood of the allegation that *He differed from his predecessors*, he tells us: that *This allegation was made against him by the Pelagians.*

Now, even if the allegation *had* been made against him by the Pelagians; still, since it was the simple allegation of A FACT, let it have been made by whom it may, no *real* importance can attach to the doctrinal character of the

eum Pelagiani, ostendit falsum esse. Citat enim, ex Ambrosio: *Christus, quem miseratur, vocat.* Item: *Si voluisset, ex indevotis, fecisset devotos. Sed Deus, quos dignatur, vocat: et, quem vult, religiosum facit.* Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 22. § 8.

allegers *as* allegers: for the allegation of A FACT, by *whomsoever* it may be made, can only be met and set aside by distinct and sufficient counter-evidence.

But, in specifically naming the Pelagians as the allegers, the object of Calvin was, I fear, disingenuously to excite, in the minds of his readers, a prejudice against the correctness of the allegation *itself*.

At all events, his statement is palpably inaccurate.

The persons, who made the allegation, conveyed to Augustine by Prosper and Hilary, and in the passage before us referred to by Calvin, were NOT, as Calvin would lead us to suppose, *the Pelagians with whom Augustine was then engaged in controversy*. On the contrary, the allegers were *those Christians of Marseilles: who, with Hilary himself at their head, heartily approved of Augustine's general confutation of Pelagianism; and who, on the openly avowed score of* NOVELTY, *objected only to his System of Election and Reprobation**. Some, indeed, apparently because these Gallican Christians rested the divine decree of Predestination upon *God's Prevision of man's future character* and not upon *God's Absolute Will and Pleasure*,

* Quibus omnibus enodatis, et multis insuper quæ altiore intuitu ad causam hanc pertinentia magis potes videre discussis, credimus et speramus, non solum tenuitatem nostram disputationum tuarum præsidio roborandam, sed etiam ipsos quoque meritis atque honoribus claros caligo istius opinionis obscurat defecatissimum lumen gratiæ recepturos. Nam UNUM EORUM præcipuæ authoritatis et spiritalium studiorum virum, sanctum HILARIUM ARELATENSEM EPISCOPUM, sciat beatitudo tua, admiratorem sectatoremque, IN ALIIS OMNIBUS, tuæ esse doctrinæ: et, de hoc quod in querelam trahit, jampridem apud sanctitatem tuam sensum suum per literas velle conferre. Prosper. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 483.

From Hilary's great attainments and high authority in the Gallican Church, I think it most probable, that *he* was the person from whom originated the trying challenge sent by the Massilian Christians to Augustine.

have invidiously charged them with Semipelagianism*. But, even by the augustinising Prosper, they are honourably described as *The Servants of Christ*† : while, by Augustine himself, they are acknowledged to have been doctrinally sound on the precise points which were controverted by Pelagius and his followers; and, in consequence of their being thus doctrinally sound, are actually, by the same Augustine, even in set terms, declared to be so far removed from the heretical perverseness of the Pelagians.‡

Let us, however, attend to the express words of Hilary, as, on the present subject, he writes to Augustine.

* Retractatis priorum de hac re opinionibus, pene omnium par invenitur et una sententia, qua propositum et prædestinationem Dei secundum præscientiam receperunt: ut, ob hoc, Deus alios vasa honoris, alios contumeliæ, fecerit, quia finem uniuscujusque præviderit, et sub ipso gratiæ adjutorio in qua futurus esset voluntate et actione præsciverit. Prosper. Epist. ad August, in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 482, 483.

Cum autem dicitur eis, quare aliis vel alicubi prædicetur, vel non prædicetur, vel nunc prædicetur quod aliquando pene omnibus sicut nunc aliquibus gentibus non prædicatum sit : dicunt, *id præscientiæ esse divinæ, ut, eo tempore, et ibi, et illis, veritas annunciaretur, vel annuncietur ; quando et ubi prænoscebatur esse credenda.* Et hoc, non solum aliorum catholicorum testimoniis, sed etiam sanctitatis tuæ disputatione antiquiore, se probare testantur. Hilar. Arelat. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 483.

† Multi ergo SERVORUM CHRISTI, qui in Massiliensi urbe consistunt. Prosper. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 481.

‡ *Nemo sibi sufficit ad incipiendum vel perficiendum quodcunque opus bonum:* quod jam isti fratres, sicut vestra scripta indicant, verum esse consentiunt. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. i. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 485.

A Pelagianorum porro hæretica perversitate tantum isti remoti sunt, propter quos hæc agimus, ut, licet nondum velint fateri *Prædestinatos esse qui per Dei gratiam fiant obedientes atque permaneant*, jam tamen fateantur, quod *Eorum præveniat voluntatem quibus datur hæc gratia.* Ibid. lib. ii. c. 16. p. 502.

Retenta ergo ista, in quæ pervenerunt, plurimum eos a Pelagianorum errore discernunt. Ibid. lib. i. c. 1. p. 485.

I ought not to refrain from mentioning: that, THIS SINGLE MATTER EXCEPTED (Augustine's doctrine, to wit, of Election and Reprobation), *they declare themselves to be, in* ALL BOTH YOUR DEEDS AND YOUR WORDS, *the steady admirers of your holiness*†.

Let us also attend to the direct testimony of Augustine himself, as he writes to Prosper and Hilary, in reply to the two several letters which he had received from them.

Those our brethren, for whom your pious charity is solicitous, have, with the Church of Christ, attained to believe: that The human race is born liable to the sin of the first man; *and that* No one can be liberated from that evil, save through the righteousness of the second man. *They have also attained to a confession: that* The will of man is prevented by the grace of God; *and that* No one is of himself sufficient either to begin or to perfect any good work. *Holding, therefore, these doctrines,* THEY ARE VERY WIDELY REMOVED FROM THE ERROR OF THE PELAGIANS. *Moreover, provided they walk in such doctrines and pray to him who giveth understanding, if they differ from us on the point of Predestination, he will also reveal this to them. Meanwhile, let it be our business to bestow upon them both the affection of love and the ministry of the word, as he, whom we supplicate, shall grant: that, in these letters, we may say, what to them may be both apt and useful**.

Such, according to Augustine's own description, are the persons, whom Calvin would exhibit as the interested *pelagian* calumniators of Augustine: such is the character, given by Hilary, of those, whom, in the unseemly capacity of conscious false accusers, the Genevan Divine would

* Sed planè illud tacere non debeo, quod se dicant tuam sanctitatem, HOC EXCEPTO, in FACTIS ET DICTIS OMNIBUS admirari. Hilar. Arelat. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 484.

† Pervenerunt autem isti fratres nostri. pro quibus solicita est pia

apparently hold up to the honest indignation of his unsuspicious readers.

(1.) I may remark: that the very language of Augustine, in the present passage, distinctly shews the NOVELTY of his cherished speculations.

If, like the genuine doctrines of *Grace*, those speculations had, invariably and notoriously, been *held* and *taught* by the Catholic Church from the beginning: he would have had small need to recommend prayer, that, to the Massilian Christians, God would *reveal* the tenet of *Predestination*.

On such a supposition, the tenet *itself*, whether abstractedly they liked it or disliked it, must, at any rate, have been *familiar* to them from their very childhood. They would have *received* it, in the course of their catechetical institution, from the regularly appointed Catechists of the Church: they would have perpetually *encountered* it, systematically embodied in the ordinary books of devotional theology; they would, again and again, have *heard* it enforced from the pulpit, as the very pith and marrow of the sincere Gospel: and, therefore, in the mere nature and necessity of things, however they might have subsequently *disliked* the doctrine, they never could have alleged against Augustine the charge of bold and unauthorised private *innovation*.

charitas vestra, ut credant, cum Ecclesia Christi: *Peccato primi hominis obnoxium nasci genus humanum; nec ab isto malo, nisi per justitiam secundi hominis, aliquem liberari.* Pervenerunt etiam, ut *Prævenire voluntates hominum Dei gratia* fateantur, atque ut *Ad nullum opus bonum vel incipiendum vel perficiendum sibi quenquam sufficere posse* consentiant. RETENTA ERGO ISTA, IN QUÆ PERVENERUNT, PLURIMUM EOS A PELAGIANORUM ERRORE DISCERNUNT. Proinde, si in eis ambulent et orent eum qui dat intellectum, si quid de Prædestinatione aliter sapiunt, ipse illis hoc quoque revelabit. Tamen etiam nos impendamus eis dilectionis affectum ministeriumque sermonis, sicut donat ille quem rogamus: ut, in his literis, ea, quæ illis essent apta et utilia, diceremus. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. i. c. 1. Oper. vol. vii. p. 485.

But they declare, that the doctrine was alike *new* and *disagreeable* to them: and, in reply, Augustine recommends prayer, that God would be pleased to *reveal* it to them; thus incidentally, by the very use of the word *reveal*, confessing that they had never heard of it before.

The allegation of NOVELTY, if I mistake not, is *itself* a proof of the matter alleged: and the expressed hope of a REVELATION, if I also mistake not, is *itself* a virtual acknowledgment of the justice of the allegation.

(2.) I may yet further remark: that even Augustine, in his own particular case, incidentally confesses his peculiar Scheme of Doctrine to be nothing better than the pure result of his insulated private judgment.

So far from asserting, that his favourite System of Election had been professedly delivered to him from antiquity by his catechetical instructors in Christianity: he acknowledges, that he had *himself* DILIGENTLY SEARCHED IT OUT AND DISCOVERED IT; for he owns, that there *was* a time when he had *not* thus searched it out and discovered it; consequently he owns, that there *was* a time when he *had* maintained an entirely different system*.

Now clearly, this never could have happened, if, from the very first, his System had *always* been the familiarly recognised System of the Church Catholic.

The obvious conclusion needs not to be drawn out in mood and form.

* Non elegit Deus opera cujusquam in præscientia quæ ipse daturus est: sed fidem elegit in præscientia, ut ut, quem sibi crediturum esse præscivit, ipsum elegerit, cui Spiritum Sanctum daret, ut, bona operando, etiam æternam vitam consequeretur. Nondum diligentius quæsiveram, nec adhuc inveneram, qualis sit Electio Gratiæ. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. i. c. 3. Oper. vol. vii. p. 486.

CHAPTER IX.

CLEMENT OF ROME AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

When we consider the mighty advantage, possessed in *his* time by Augustine, over any inquirer of the present day, from the circumstance of numerous early ecclesiastical writings being *then* extant which have *now* perished; and when we recollect, that, although urged by a direct and pointed challenge, he ventured not, in evidence of the apostolicity of his peculiarities, to produce any testimonies more ancient than those (with whatever emolument) of Cyprian and Ambrose and Gregory-Nazianzen: when we further bear in mind, that Calvin, whose extensive theological learning is undoubted, makes not an effort *himself* to carry back the System, which bears his name, beyond the time of Augustine; and when we reflect, that, even of the three witnesses adduced by *Augustine*, he tacitly gives up two, and contents himself with reminding us that Ambrose had been brought forward in evidence: when all these things are duly weighed, it may appear not a little extraordinary, that a modern ecclesiastical historian should claim for Augustine, what Augustine never claimed for himself, the testimony, to wit, of those two preëminently early Divines, Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch; the one, a declared fellow-labourer with St. Paul; the other, an immediate disciple of St. John. Yet such is the claim put forth by Mr. Milner: in sincerity, I doubt not; with what cogency, it may be desirable to examine.

I. According to Mr. Milner, *The strictly Primitive*

Church, which received her Theology immediately from the lips of the Apostles, held the doctrine of Election, as that doctrine has been subsequently explained by Augustine and Calvin.

As to what might be her views of the allied doctrines of *Reprobation* and *Particular Redemption*, Mr. Milner is silent; but, in regard to the specific doctrine of *Election*, such is the theory of the historian: and, for its substantiation, his authorities are Clement and Ignatius.

1. The evidential passage adduced from Clement, as given in Mr. Milner's own words, is the following.

Let us go to him in sanctification of heart, lifting up holy hands to him, influenced by the love of our gracious and compassionate Father, WHO, BY HIS ELECTION, HATH MADE US HIS PECULIAR PEOPLE. *Since, therefore,* WE ARE THE ELECT OF GOD, *holy and beloved, let us work the works of holiness*.*

The passage before us is taken from Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians; and the account, which Mr. Milner gives of that Epistle, is; that *The doctrine of* ELECTION *runs remarkably through it in connection with holiness, as the Scripture always states it†.*

2. With respect to Ignatius, the following, equally in his own words, is the evidential passage, which Mr. Milner has extracted from his writings.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the worthily

* I subjoin the original of the passage, intended, I suppose, by Mr. Milner: for he gives no reference.

Προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ εὔσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 29.

† Milner's Hist. of the Church of Christ. cent. i. chap. 15. vol. i. p. 148.

happy Church in Ephesus of Asia, blessed in the majesty and fulness of God the Father, PREDESTINATED BEFORE THE WORLD TO BE PERPETUALLY PERMANENT IN GLORY, *immoveable, united, and* ELECT, *in the genuine suffering for the truth, by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God, much joy in Jesus Christ and his spotless grace*.*

This passage constitutes the introductory salutation of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians: and it may be proper to subjoin Mr. Milner's accompanying remarks.

The Church of Ephesus appears, from the Epistle of Ignatius to them, still to have maintained its character of evangelical purity. Their zeal, indeed, had decayed, but was revived: and the rage of persecution was the hot-bed, which reanimated their souls, and made them fruitful again in faith and hope and charity. The very titles, by which he addresses them, demonstrate, what their faith was in common with that of the whole Church at that time: and abundantly shew the vanity of those, whose dislike of the peculiar truths of Christianity induces them to suppose, that the ideas of PREDESTINATION *and* ELECTION *and* GRACE *were purely the systematic inventions of Augustine, and were unknown to the primitive Christians. We are certain, that St. Paul's Epistles, and that particularly addressed to this Church, are full of the same things†.*

II. Having given Mr. Milner's authorities for his opinion

* I again give the original.

Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, τῇ εὐλογημένῃ ἐν μεγέθει Θεοῦ Πατρὸς πληρώματι, τῇ προωρισμένῃ πρὸ αἰώνων διὰ παντὸς εἰς δόξαν, παράμονον, ἄτρεπτον, ἡνωμένην, καὶ ἐκλελεγμένην, ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ, ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀξιομακαρίστῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, πλεῖστα ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ καὶ ἐν ἀμώμῳ χάριτι χαίρειν. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. § 1.

† Milner's Hist. of the Church of Christ. cent. ii. chap. 1. vol. i. p. 177.

as he himself has produced them, I shall now proceed to inquire into the effective amount of their testimony.

1. His first witness, we have seen, is Clement of Rome.

(1.) In regard to this very early Father, Mr. Milner tells us: that *The doctrine of* ELECTION *runs remarkably through his first Epistle to the Corinthians.*

Such a statement can scarcely be deemed accurate. It would obviously lead a mere English reader to conclude: that *The special subject of that Epistle is the doctrine of* ELECTION. Yet that doctrine is, in no wise, its subject. As any person may satisfy himself by the very simple process of reading it, the subject of the Epistle is, in truth, not *The doctrine of Election*, but *The sin and mischief of Schism**.

For the convenience of reference, the Epistle has been divided into sixty sections: and, instead of the doctrine of *Election* running remarkably through the whole of it, the terms *Elect* or *Election*, quite incidentally, occur exactly nine several times†.

* Clement's Epistle has been translated into English by Abp. Wake, and more recently by my learned and valued friend Mr. Chevalier. The latter justly remarks: that *The main object of the Epistle is to correct particular disorders in the Church of Corinth.* Introd. p. 24.

† Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 1, 2, 6, 29, 46, 49, 50, 52, 58. The precise term *Elect* occurs yet a tenth time in the Epistle: but then it occurs, not in a sentence written by Clement himself, but only in an inaccurate *memoriter* citation of our Lord's words, as they are recorded in Luke xvii. 1, 2. Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 46. The word ἐκλεκτῶν does not occur in the original of St. Luke, nor yet in the two parallel passages of Matt. xviii. 6, 7, and Mark ix. 42. I may also add, that one even of the nine instances of occurrence consists only in the circumstance of David, with evident reference to Psalm lxxviii. 71, being styled *The Elect David:* ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς Δαβίδ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 52. Thus I might fairly say, that, for any available purposes of doctrinal testimony, the term occurs no more than eight times.

(2.) Rejecting, then, Mr. Milner's broad allegation, and readily admitting the naked fact of a ninefold occurrence, we shall find the real question to be: not *Whether Clement* USES *the terms*, but *In what* SENSE *he uses them.*

Now, that Clement uses the terms *Elect* and *Election* in the augustinian or calvinistic SENSE of those terms, Mr. Milner has not *proved*: nor, indeed, does he even *attempt* to prove. On the contrary, he first *assumes* the very point, which he ought to have *established*: and then he brings forward his *assumption*, under the avowed aspect of its being a sufficient historical testimony, that *The augustinian or calvinistic doctrine of Election was, from the very beginning, taught by Clement of Rome, as the familiar and universally received doctrine of the earliest Church Catholic.*

I have carefully perused all the passages, wherein Clement employs the terms before us; and, neither from the context nor yet from the management of the phraseology, can we legitimately derive the very slightest evidence; that *The Bishop of Rome in the first century understood them, as they were interpreted by the Bishop of Hippo in the fifth century.*

Clement, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul, taught, no doubt, the doctrine of *Election*, as that doctrine was expounded by ST. PAUL: but to assert, without a shadow of proof, that he *therefore* must have taught the doctrine of *Election*, as that doctrine was expounded by AUGUSTINE, is clearly a mere gratuitous assumption.

Nothing is more delusive, than the building of a theory upon bare insulated words*.

The same *words* are, indeed, used, both by Clement and by Augustine: but the matter, which Mr. Milner ought to

* Le monde se paye de parolles: peu approfondissent les choses. Pascal. Lettr. Provincial. Lett. ii. p. 18.

have established, is; that *The same* WORDS *were severally used by them in the same* SENSE.

Now, in not one of the nine passages where the terms occur, is there the slightest indication, that Clement employed them as Augustine confessedly employed them*.

Mr. Milner has brought forward what may be deemed as strong a passage as any of the nine; though, verily, in point of evidential cogency, they stand quite upon a level: let us, therefore, see, what special benefit his System can derive from it.

Our compassionate Father, by his Election, hath made us his peculiar people.

Thus speaks Clement, according to Mr. Milner's translation.

Our compassionate Father hath made us, unto himself, a part of the Election,

Thus speaks Clement, according to a more strictly accurate version.

In point of import, there is no very material difference between the two translations: for, though, in the *present* passage, Clement uses not the phrase *Peculiar People;* yet, in *another* place, he actually *does* employ it precisely as Mr. Milner makes him employ it *here*†. We may, therefore, proceed to our inquiry without any further prefatory remark.

Now, in the passage before us, whether according to Mr. Milner's translation or according to my own translation, what is there to authorise the assertion, that Clement symbolised with Augustine respecting the doctrine of *Election?*

* These various passages are all fully cited below, book ii. chap. 2. § 1. 1. It may be proper to remark, that, in Clement's second Epistle to the Corinthians, the terms *Elect* and *Election* never occur.

† Ὁ παντόπτης Θεὸς,—ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad. Corinth. i. § 58.

In truth, so far from the passage warranting any such assertion, it is, when closely examined, absolutely irreconcileable with the System advocated by Augustine.

The Bishop of Hippo taught *The sovereign Election of certain individuals to eternal life, not only out of the unbelieving world at large, but likewise out of the various members of the visible Church itself.*

But Clement, by his use of a pluralising phraseology in the first person, shews us: that he considered ALL the members collectively both of the Church of Rome and of the Church of Corinth to be a part of the general Election or a part of the great body of God's Elect: for the Epistle is addressed to the *whole* Church of Corinth in the name of the *whole* Church of Rome*; and the plural terms *We* and *Us* abundantly indicate, that, in *his* sense of the word *Elect*, that word was descriptively appropriate to EVERY member of the Church Catholic. Such an extension of the word forbids the supposition, that, by *Election*, Clement understood *An Election, directly and immediately and irreversibly, to eternal life:* for, *had* he so understood it, he must have believed, what yet he could not have believed, that not a single member of the Church Catholic would perish. Accordingly, in point of IDEALITY, he makes *Election* respect, not *An indefeasible admission to the kingdom of heaven*, but *An adoption through Christ to be a peculiar people as the Israelites were adopted collectively to be a peculiar people under the old dispensation.*

This is quite clear from the contextual close of the passage now before us: for Mr. Milner has cited it in a somewhat mutilated form. That no doubt may be left on the mind of the cautious inquirer, I subjoin the *entire* passage with its explanatory conclusion.

* See the salutation or superscription of the Epistle.

Let us, therefore, approach unto the Lord in holiness of soul, lifting up to him holy and unpolluted hands, loving our clement and merciful Father, WHO HATH MADE US, UNTO HIMSELF, A PART OF THE ELECTION. *For thus it is written:* When the Most High divided the nations; as he scattered the sons of Adam, he appointed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the angels. Then his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord: Israel, the lot of his inheritance. *And, in another place, he says:* Behold, the Lord taketh unto himself a nation from the midst of the nations, as a man taketh the first fruits of his threshing floor; and, out of that nation, shall come the holy of holies. *Wherefore, since we are a part of the Holy One, let us do all those things that pertain unto holiness**.

From this citation it will be seen, that Mr. Milner, passing immediately, from Clement's mention of *The Election*, to the practical inference that *by a life of holiness we should strive to make our Calling and Election sure*, altogether omits the very important intervening explanatory clause. Yet does that clause most distinctly teach us: that, in the estimate of Clement, the friend and fellow-labourer with St. Paul, *Election under the Gospel*, as propounded by that Apostle, was strictly homogeneous with the *Election of the Israelites under the Law to be God's peculiar people contradistinctively to the various pretermitted nations of the pagan world.*

Such, with perfect concinnity, in every one of the nine places where he mentions *Election*, is the IDEA of it conveyed by Clement: so that, instead of being a witness in favour of Mr. Milner's theory, he is really a witness in direct opposition to it.

2. Mr. Milner's second witness is Ignatius of Antioch.

* Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 29, 30.

(1.) In the way of Evidence, Mr. Milner adduces only the introductory superscription of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians: he might also, with equal cogency, have adduced the introductory superscription of the Epistle to the Trallians*.

Doubtless, in these two several superscriptions, Ignatius uses the term *Predestinate* once and the term *Elect* twice: but, in no other part of his seven Epistles, either incidentally or systematically, does any such phraseology again occur.

Here, therefore, the question is precisely the same, as it was in the case of Clement.

Does Ignatius, or does he not, use those terms in the SENSE *advocated by Augustine and Calvin?*

Mr. Milner acts in the present case, exactly as he acted in the previous case. Every thing is rapidly taken for granted. That *Ignatius augustinised*, he brings neither actual proof nor attempted proof. He assumes: that *The phraseology used by Ignatius ought to be understood in the* SENSE, *wherein the same phraseology, when employed by Augustine, ought confessedly and indisputably to be understood.* And this mere gratuitous assumption he brings forward, under the aspect of its being a sufficient testimony: that *The earliest Church, as taught by the Apostles personally, and therefore as morally incapable of misunderstanding the drift of their inspired explanatory communications, held the doctrine of Election as that doctrine was subsequently propounded by Augustine and Calvin.*

Such a process as this I cannot but deem historically illegitimate. The truth of the matter is: that, while we have not a shadow of proof that *Ignatius augustinised*, we have sufficient evidence, from the very texture of his

* Ignat. Epist. ad Tralles. § 1. See the passage cited below, book ii. chap. 2. § 1. 2. (2.)

phraseology, that his sentiments respecting *Election* were the same as those of Clement.

To the worthily happy Church in Ephesus of Asia, predestinated before the world to be perpetually permanent in glory.

Thus speaks Ignatius, according to Mr. Milner's translation.

To the Church deserving beatification in Ephesus of Asia, always predestinated before the worlds to glory, that it should be permanent.

Thus speaks Ignatius, according to a more strictly accurate version,

Now what do we learn from such language? Does it warrant us to conclude, with Mr. Milner, that *Ignatius symbolised with Augustine in his view of Election?* Nothing of the sort. According to Ignatius, the *Always predestinated before the worlds to glory* is not *An aggregate of individuals, elected to indefeasible happiness, both out of the unbelieving world and out of the visible Church herself also;* but *The entire Church in Ephesus of Asia:* and this *Predestination to glory* is not *An Irreversible Predestination of every member of that Church to eternal happiness;* but *A Predestination to glory, in purpose and intention,* or (in other words) *A Predestination, in order that permanent holiness should in every individual instance be the result, and thence, so far as God's moral purpose and merciful intention are concerned, that eternal glory should finally be attained.*

The IDEA, in short, annexed by Ignatius to Election, was that of *An Election of all the individuals, who constituted any particular Church, into the pale of Christ's Church Catholic: with an intention on God's part, that, through permanence in holiness, they might all attain to glory; but, with a possibility, through their own perverseness, that some might fall away and perish.*

This is abundantly manifest from the language which he

himself uses in this very Epistle to the Ephesians. While he addresses the *entire* Church of Ephesus, as being *always predestinated before the worlds to glory;* he feelingly asks, from the knowledge that but too many *individuals* of that collectively predestinated Church were not labouring to make their Election sure: *Why are we not all wise; seeing we have received the knowledge of God, which is Jesus Christ? Why do we suffer ourselves foolishly to perish; not considering the gift, which the Lord hath truly sent to us* ?*

(2.) In connection, Mr. Milner remarks: that *The titles, ascribed by Ignatius to the Ephesians, shew the vanity of those persons, whose dislike of the peculiar truths of Christianity induces them to suppose, that the ideas of* PREDESTINATION *and* ELECTION *and* GRACE *were purely the systematic invention of Augustine, and were unknown to the primitive Christians.*

I regret, that so estimable a man as Mr. Milner should have condescended to a style of misrepresentation unhappily the reverse of infrequent.

All those, who reject his own exhibition of the doctrines of *Election* and *Predestination*, he describes as being *hostile to the peculiar truths of Christianity:* and the several ideas of *Predestination* and *Election* and *Grace* he so links together, as to import, that *No persons can hold the doctrine of Grace, unless they also symbolise with Augustine in his views of Absolute Election to eternal glory.*

That Mr. Milner should have thus written, I sincerely regret. Such statements serve only to injure the cause of truth, by exciting, in the minds of the hasty or the intemperate, the worst kind of prejudice: prejudice, I mean, not merely childish and uninquiring; but prejudice, founded upon a direct inaccuracy of representation.

* Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. § 17.

I may add, that his writing to this effect is the more unfair, because he claims for *himself* a liberty of dijudication which he denies to *others*. Of the genuine Augustinian Scheme, Mr. Milner unceremoniously rejects about ONE HALF: for, while he retains Augustine's doctrine of *Absolute Election to eternal life;* he rejects, with what consistency I stop not now to inquire, both Augustine's logically consecutive doctrine of *Particular Redemption*, and Augustine's logically correlative doctrine of *Absolute Preteritive Reprobation to eternal death**. Yet, if a person ventures to doubt whether Augustine's doctrine of *Absolute Election to eternal life* was not the pure systematising invention of Augustine himself, Mr. Milner forthwith pronounces him an enemy to the catholic doctrine of *Divine Free Grace.*

Whether the Augustinian Scheme be scripturally true or scripturally false, the question of its soundness or its unsoundness must be settled, not by an alleged liking or disliking of the peculiar truths of Christianity, but by a comprehensive adduction and a sober sifting of evidence.

If it can be proved, that, *On the professed personal explanatory teaching of the Apostles, the entire earliest Church held and delivered the augustinian view of Election and Predestination:* then, doubtless, on the very strictest principles of legitimate testimony, we must all, either embrace *it*, or reject *Christianity itself.* But, if this matter cannot be proved: then, surely, the honest inquirer, who, purely from want of evidence, finds that he cannot rationally adopt it, ought not to be stigmatised, as a vain individual who is solely influenced by his dislike of the peculiar truths of Christianity.

* See Milner's Pract. Serm. vol. ii. serm. 17. p. 242–247. The passage is cited above, book i. chap. 5. in init.

CHAPTER X.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

THE theory of Mr. Milner, that *The strictly Primitive Church held the doctrine of Election as that doctrine is defined by Augustine and Calvin*, drew after it an obvious difficulty, the necessity of solving which imposed upon him the construction of yet another and subsidiary theory.

His first theory he claimed to have historically established by adducing the alleged authorities of Clement and Ignatius: but, on the very ground of its presumed establishment, the difficulty, to which I have alluded, forthwith presented itself.

Mr. Milner contended: that *The earliest Church, in the first instance,* UNIVERSALLY *held the doctrine of Augustinian Election.*

Yet the FACT, that *That doctrine, thus alleged to have been* UNIVERSAL *in the first century, had* TOTALLY *vanished in the second century, and did not reappear until Augustine revived it at the beginning of the fifth century:* this FACT could be neither denied nor dissembled*.

How, then, are we to account for the extraordinary cir-

* Such is the FACT *generally* admitted by Mr. Milner. But, afterward, not quite consistently, he describes, what we now call *Calvinism*, as being the religious System of a Party, which still, in the middle of the third century, continued to exist within the pale of the Church: for he contrasts the Christian humility of Cyprian in not opposing that System, with the pelagianising presumption of Origen in arguing against it. Hist. of the Church of Christ, cent. iii. chap. 15. § 2. vol. i. p. 520, 521.

This statement, I am compelled to say, rests upon a very unfortunate

cumstance, that *A doctrine, delivered* (we are told) *by the Apostles, and* UNIVERSALLY *held* (we are assured) *by the Church of the first century, should, in the course of the second century and during the very lives of those who were taught by the disciples of the Apostles, totally disappear?*

I. The attempted solution of this difficulty gave rise to Mr. Milner's second and subsidiary theory.

As the strictly Primitive Church held the doctrine of Election, in accordance with that view of it which was subsequently taken by Augustine: so the doctrine in question continued to be faithfully maintained, until, with Justin Martyr, philosophy crept into the fold of Christ. Then the ancient System began to fall into discredit: while a Pelagianising Scheme of Self-determining Free Will gradually usurped its place.

But let us, in all fairness, hear the precise words, wherein Mr. Milner sets forth this supposed corruption of primitive doctrine which originated (he contends) with Justin Martyr*.

In fundamentals, Justin Martyr was unquestionably sound.

misapprehension. Origen is not arguing (as Mr. Milner supposes) against the *Calvinists* of the third century; for no such religionists were then in existence: but he is arguing against the Fatalising Scheme of the *Manichèans* and *Gnostics*, with a special reference, apparently, to the followers of Basilides and Marcion. See below, book ii. chap. 1. § 1. 1. (1.) note.

* Certainly, the fate of Justin, in the hands of those who have criticised his conduct, has been not a little hard and infelicitous.

Previous to his conversion to Christianity, he had been a Platonist: and, *after* his conversion, he renounced, with the strongest expressions of contempt, the Philosophy to which he had once addicted himself, declaring that Christianity is the *only* sure Philosophy, and professing that he had received all his doctrinal System *within the pale of the Church.*

Yet, according to Dr. Priestley, the Church, for the tenet of the *Logos*, is indebted to the Philosophy of Justin: and, according to Mr. Milner, it was this same Philosophy of Justin, which led him, in the second

Yet there seems, however, something in his train of thinking, which was the effect of his philosophic spirit, and which produced notions not altogether agreeable to the genius of the Gospel.—

There is a phraseology, in the last page of his Trypho, extremely suspicious. He speaks of a Self-determining Power in man: and uses much the same kind of known reasoning on the obscure subject of Free Will, as that which has been fashionable since the days of Arminius. He seems to have been the first of all sincere Christians, who introduced this foreign plant into Christian ground. I shall venture to call it foreign, till its right to exist in the soil shall have been proved from scriptural evidence. It is very plain, that I do not mistake his meaning, because he never explicitly owns the doctrine of Election: though, with happy inconsistency, like many other real Christians, he involved it in his experience, and implies it in various parts of his writings.

But the stranger, once admitted, was not easily expelled. The language of the Church was gradually and silently changed, in this respect, from that more simple and scriptural mode of speaking used by Clement and Ignatius. Those Primitive Christians knew the doctrine of THE ELECTION OF GRACE, *but not that of* THE SELF-DETERMINING POWER OF THE HUMAN WILL. *We shall see, hereafter, the progress of the evil, and its arrival at full maturity under the fostering hand of Pelagius*.*

century, to disown and smother the pristine doctrine of *Augustinian Election*.

Surely, it is strange and unaccountable, that a *rejected* and even *despised* Philosophy should have produced these extraordinary results of addition and subtraction. See my Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, book ii. chap. 6. § iv. and book ii. chap. 8. § i. 1.

* Milner's Hist. of the Church of Christ. cent. ii. chap. 3. vol. i. p. 227–229.

II. Such is the second theory of Mr. Milner, which, in order to make his Scheme round and consistent, was plainly rendered necessary by his first theory.

With respect, then, to Justin, Mr. Milner, we see, very fairly states: that this eminent individual, who flourished in the ecclesiastical generation next to Ignatius, and who was catechetically instructed in the truths of the Gospel only thirty years after the death of St. John, *never explicitly owns the doctrine of Election;* that is to say (for such is Mr. Milner's *real* meaning), *never explicitly owns the doctrine of Election as that doctrine is understood and explained by Augustine.* But, for this acknowledged circumstance, he accounts, on the ground: that *His philosophic spirit led to a train of thinking, which produced notions not altogether agreeable to the genius of the Gospel.*

1. That *Justin*, as Mr. Milner confesses, *never owns the doctrine of Election as that doctrine was subsequently explained by Augustine and Calvin*, is, indeed, most perfectly true. Yet the undoubted *truth* of the fact derogates nothing from its *singularity:* for, when we consider the very early age in which he lived, it surely appears not a little remarkable, on the hypothesis of *The scriptural correctness of the augustinian explanation*, that no traces of any such doctrine should appear in his various writings.

St. John died in the year 100: and Justin was converted to Christianity about the year 130. Hence the necessity of Chronology demonstrates: that *The catechetical instructors of Justin, from whom he distinctly professes himself and his contemporaries to have received the doctrine and the joint adoration of the Three Persons in the One Godhead, must have touched on the age of St. John*.*

* See Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 43. Commel. 1593.

If, then, *Austinism* were the apostolically delivered and the apostolically received doctrine of the Catholic Church, *down to* the death of St. John, or rather (on Mr. Milner's supposition that *Ignatius* was a doctrinal Austinist) even *beyond* the death of St. John: it clearly must, in the shape of regular catechetical instruction, have been duly communicated to Justin and his christian contemporaries; communicated too (be it carefully observed), not with the sort of doubtful authority on which it might *now* be communicated, but notoriously and confessedly on the invincible authority of the inspired personal explanatory teaching of the Apostles; or, at all events, if it had not been absolutely communicated by the Catechist, it certainly, if it were the universal doctrine of the Church, must have become well known to Justin very soon after his baptism.

Yet, while Justin, in various parts of his Works, strongly insists upon the doctrines of *The Trinity* and of *The godhead and incarnation of Christ* and of *The Atonement effected by his most precious blood-shedding* and of *The illuminating and strengthening Grace of the Holy Spirit* with sundry other acknowledged catholic doctrines; he never, as Mr. Milner says, explicitly owns the doctrine of *Augustinian Election:* though, nevertheless, if Augustinian Election were really an apostolic doctrine, Justin, by Mr. Milner's *own* hypothesis, *must* have received *it* exactly on the same authority as he received the *other* doctrines which have been specified.

In regard to this knotty point, Mr. Milner, not very congruously with his subsequent attempted solution, tells us: that *Justin, with happy inconsistency, involved the doctrine of Election* (that is to say, the doctrine of Augustinian Election) *in his experience, and implies it in various parts of his writings.*

What particular portions of Justin's writings Mr. Milner may here allude to, I know not, as he gives neither *references* nor *citations:* and, even if he were correct in the *induction* upon which (I suppose) he would found such an opinion; still, as matters stand, how are we to account for what the historian styles *his happy inconsistency?* Justin was no daring and opinionated heretic, prompt, like a Gnostic or a Cerinthian or an Ebionite, to set up his own private speculations against the authority of the Apostles: on the contrary, as Mr. Milner confesses, *in fundamentals he was unquestionably sound.* If, then, he had received the doctrine of *Augustinian Election* upon undeniable apostolical authority; which, on the hypothesis of Mr. Milner, when we recollect his place in chronology, he inevitably *must* have done: how are we to account, not merely for his extraordidary silence, but for his actual inconsistency?

In the *present* day, we may easily conceive a truly pious and fundamentally sound Christian to be inconsistent on the point of *Augustinian Election*, disowning it in words, but building upon it in that inward operation of the soul which the historian means by the term *Experience;* it is not, however, quite so easy to imagine an occurrence of the same inconsistency in the days of *Justin.*

A man, who had received his Christianity from the contemporaries and disciples of St. John, *must*, simply as a matter of FACT, have inevitably known: *Whether, in their personal explanation, the Apostles did, or did not, teach the doctrine of Election in the same manner as it was subsequently understood and propounded by Augustine and Calvin.* And, if this man were a truly pious man, which Mr. Milner admits to have been the case with the martyred Justin; and if, IN FACT, he *had* received the doctrine of *Augustinian Election* as being *then* notoriously and incontrovertibly the

doctrine taught by the Apostles: it is difficult to comprehend, how he could have systematically ventured to *refrain* from owning it, or how (as Mr. Milner speaks) he could have been guilty of *any* inconsistency on the subject.

Circumstanced, therefore, as Justin was, in point both of admitted personal piety and of infallibly sure transmission of doctrine: he had literally but a *yea* and a *nay* to make his choice from; he had literally no alternative, save either to receive or to contradict the decision of the Apostles.

He never, says Mr. Milner, *explicitly owns the doctrine of Election.*

In the case of a truly pious and thoroughly well informed believer, how did this happen, if the doctrine of *Augustinian Election* were notoriously taught by the Apostles, and if as such it were no less notoriously received by that Church which communicated to Justin the whole of his catechumenical and post-catechumenical instruction?

2. The total silence of so very early a writer as Justin on the topic of *Augustinian Election*, Mr. Milner evidently felt to be a matter, which, with *his* sentiments and with *his* original theory upon his hands, he was bound to account for.

Now the natural reason, which we should be apt to assign for such a silence, is: that *Justin had never heard of the doctrine of Augustinian or Calvinistic Election.*

But Mr. Milner, while he allows the *piety* of the martyr; while he admits him to have been *unquestionably sound in fundamentals;* while he cannot deny, that, if the doctrine of *Augustinian Election* had been *really* delivered to the Church by the Apostles, Justin, in *his* day, must have *infallibly* known such to be the case; nay while he himself would fain exhibit Justin as a sort of internally convinced,

though (on *such* an hypothesis) a most unaccountably and most superfluously concealed, Calvinist, who, in various parts of his writings, IMPLIES the doctrine of that species of *Election:* Mr. Milner, under *all* these circumstances, and in direct inconsistency with the *last* of them, would solve the problem of Justin's silence, on the plea; that *He had* DEPARTED *from the primitive faith through his love of Philosophy.*

This, then, is Mr. Milner's solution of a known and felt difficulty.

Though Justin involved the doctrine of Calvinistic Election in his experience, and implied it in various parts of his writings: yet his love of Philosophy not only forbad him explicity to own it, but even actually produced notions on the subject not altogether agreeable to the genius of the Gospel.

Such, in the form of a solution, are the strangely inconsistent results, which Mr. Milner brings out of Justin's alleged love of Philosophy. Meanwhile, as if to make confusion still worse confounded, Justin *himself*, after his conversion to Christianity, actually treats this same Philosophy with utter and studied and repeated and systematic contempt*.

Surely, a man must be determined, at all hazards, to persuade himself, that *Augustinian Election was the doctrine delivered by the Apostles to the strictly Primitive Church*, if he can be satisfied with a solution: which exhibits Justin, as being so mightily under the influence of a professedly discarded and despised Philosophy, as to disown, for *its* sake, a doctrine then (by the theory) universally and certainly known to be apostolical: and which makes him, at once, pretermit through philosophical dislike, and yet never-

* Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 172, 173, 174. Cohort. ad. Græc. p. 3, 4, 6, 7.

theless involve and imply, the self-same Scheme of doctrinal exposition.

The whole of this is an inconsistency, not *happy*, but, in the case and age of Justin, I should think, *absolutely impossible.*

3. There is one matter yet to be noticed, before the present topic is dismissed.

Justin, says Mr. Milner, *never explicitly owns the doctrine of Election.*

This assertion, as I have already observed, is perfectly true; if, by the term *Election*, we understand *Augustinian Election:* but it is NOT true; if, by the term *Election*, we understand *Election according to Justin's own view of the doctrine.*

In *such* a sense of the word, Justin is so far from *never* explicitly owning the doctrine of *Election*, that he *twice*, in his Dialogue with Trypho, both unreservedly acknowledges it, and distinctly gives its meaning.

We Christians are no mere contemptible mob:—but GOD HATH ALSO ELECTED US; *and hath manifested himself to those, who inquired not after him.—Through the like calling that he called Abraham, charging him to go out from the land in which he dwelt; through that voice* HE HATH CALLED ALL OF US: *and we have now come out from the polity in which we lived, living wickedly according to the common practices of the other inhabitants of the earth*.*

* Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος ὄῆμος ἐσμὲν·—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐμφανὴς ἐλενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν.—Διὰ τῆς ὁμοίας κλήσεως φωνῆ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν (Ἀβραὰμ), εἰπὼν ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐν ᾗ ὤκει· καὶ ἡμᾶς δὲ ἅπαντας, δι' ἐκείνης τῆς φωνῆς ἐκάλεσε· καὶ ἐξήλθομεν ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἐν ᾗ ἐζῶμεν, κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς γῆς οἰκητόρων κακῶς ζῶντες.—Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 272.

Inasmuch as he took out of all nations the nation of the Jews, a nation useless and disobedient and faithless: he hath shewn, that THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN ELECTED OUT OF EVERY NATION *are, through Christ, obedient to his counsel*.*

From these two perfectly unambiguous passages, we learn, with abundant clearness, Justin's view of the scriptural doctrine of *Election.* He evidently understood it, precisely in the same sense as it was understood by Clement the friend and fellow-labourer of St. Paul; and, I may add, in the same sense as it was understood by Ignatius the martyred disciple of St. John†.

Justin, who was taught by the immediate successors of the Apostles, apprehended God's Elect to be: *The whole body of Christians, called and brought out of all nations into the pale of the visible Church, so as there to constitute one Chosen Nation or Polity; after the same manner, and according to the same* IDEALITY, *as the Israelites had been called and chosen out of all nations to be God's Elect and Peculiar and Privileged People.*

When Mr. Milner stated, that *Justin never explicitly owns the doctrine of Election*, he ought, I think, to have also stated: that *Justin* DOES *explicitly own the doctrine of Election, though not as that doctrine was subsequently expounded by Augustine and Calvin.*

* Ἐκ πάντων δὲ τῶν γενῶν, γένος ἑαυτῷ λαβὼν τὸ ὑμέτερον, γένος ἄχρηστον καὶ ἀπειθὲς καὶ ἄπιστον, δείξας τοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς γένους αἱρουμένους πεπεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τῇ βουλῇ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 282.

† See above, book i. chap. 9. § II.

CHAPTER XI.

THE DOCTRINE OF FREE WILL, AS UNDERSTOOD BY JUSTIN MARTYR AND THE EARLY FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

In association with a philosophic spirit, which forbad Justin explicitly to own the doctrine of *Election* as it was subsequently explained by Augustine, though that same philosophic spirit did not prevent him from involving it in his experience and even implying it in various parts of his writings, Mr. Milner alleges: that *He was the first sincere Christian, who introduced into the Church the foreign plant of Free Will; using the same kind of reasoning on the subject, as that, which, in modern times, has been fashionable since the days of Arminius.*

The charge, thus brought against Justin, leads us into the *evidential* or *historical* discussion of a very important subject. I say *evidential* or *historical*, designedly and advisedly: for, as to any *abstract* or *metaphysical* discussion of the much vexed topic of *Free Will*, I decline such a task altogether; both because it is entirely foreign to the plan of the present Work, and because I deem it alike useless and unsatisfactory*.

I. In the allegation preferred by Mr. Milner, he appears to me to have totally mistaken the real sentiments of Justin: which, in truth, were the same as those of Irenèus and

* The difficulties, involved in this discussion, are no way peculiar to the Protestant Churches: they equally exist among the conflicting divines of the Church of Rome. See Pascal. Lettr. Provincial. Lett. ii.

Tertullian and Cyprian and Theophilus and Tatian and Athanasius and Cyril of Jerusalem and even (what, in the present matter, is of prime importance) Augustine himself For he intimates, that *Justin held Free Will, on the grace-denying principles of Pelagius:* whereas Justin, like the other ancient Fathers, contended for *Free Will*, on totally *different* principles, and with a totally *different* object.

I shall first explain these principles and this object: then proceed to a verifying examination of Justin's own language: and then, with respect to Divine Grace, exhibit Justin's own sentiments.

1. In the course of his various writings, Justin enters upon the topic of *Human Free Will* exactly five times.

Now, upon all these several occasions, he is arguing, either against the sophistical perverseness of the Jews, or against the fatalising dogmatism of the Stoics.

Hence he maintains *The Freedom of the Human Will*, not under the pelagian aspect of *excluding the necessity of Divine Grace*, but under the totally different aspect of *man's* SPONTANEOUSLY PREFERRING *the line of conduct which he adopts* as contradistinguished from *man's* BEING FATALLY COMPELLED *to adopt a line of conduct* AGAINST *his will or his choice or his preference or his inclination.*

That is to say, when Justin maintains the existence of *A self-determining Power of* PREFERENCE: he does not take the part of those who deny the need of *Divine Grace;* but he is merely arguing against the professed advocates of *Absolute Fatalism.*

2. While the five passages in question are successively exhibited, let this prefatory remark be borne in mind: and Justin, I trust, will then stand absolved of any tendency to Pelagianism.

(1.) The passage, specially referred to by Mr. Milner as

condemnatory of Justin, occurs toward the close of his Dialogue with Trypho: but, if we attend to its drift and context, we shall readily perceive, that, so far from bearing out the historian in his allegation, it fully establishes the justice of the general introductory remark, which, by a simple consideration of facts, I have been induced to propound.

Justin's contemporaries, the unbelieving Jews, were inclined, it appears, to retort upon Christians, in the way of an *argumentum ad hominem*, their own palmary doctrine of *The Necessity of Christ's Death in order to the Salvation of man.*

Their argument was to the following effect.

If Christ, as you tell us, MUST *be crucified; and if his death* MUST *be effected through the agency of what you call the murderous transgression of the Jewish People: why are* WE *to blame; seeing that, by your own statement, matters were so fatally preordained that they could not have happened otherwise?*

To this sophism, Justin has an easy and prompt reply.

Christians hold not the doctrine of a Fatal Necessity, which exempts from all moral responsibility: but they believe both men and angels to be endowed with a Self-determining Power of Free Will; so that no irresistible, and therefore morally exonerating, constraint is laid upon their choice of this action or of that action. Hence, according to the principles asserted by Christians, though the death of Christ was necessary to the salvation of man, so that man could not have been saved without it: yet the Jews acted with perfect freedom of WILL, *evinced by a deliberate mental* PREFERENCE *of their own selected line of conduct, when they crucified the predicted Redeemer. Consequently, like the fallen angels, they might justly be punished: inasmuch as, quite* SPONTANEOUSLY *and*

without any constraint upon their INCLINATIONS, *they acted contrary to justice and right reason*.*

Such is the substance and drift of the passage, which Mr. Milner very briefly refers to, for the purpose of evidentially proving: that Justin was the first of all sincere Christians, who introduced into the Church the foreign plant of Pelagianising Free Will.

(2.) Another passage, on the human and angelic power of Self-determination, will be found somewhat earlier in the same Dialogue; and, like that which was last noticed, it simply bears upon the topic of *Absolute Unspontaneous Fatalism.*

If a person asks; Why God might not have killed Herod, rather than permit him to plot against the life of Christ: I answer, that we might just as well ask; Why God did not

* Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι οὐκ αἰτία τοῦ Θεοῦ οἱ προγινωσκόμενοι καὶ γενησόμενοι ἄδικοι, εἴτε ἄγγελοι εἴτε ἄνθρωποι γίνονται φαῦλοι, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος αἰτίᾳ τοιοῦτοι εἰσιν ὁποῖος ἕκαστος φανήσεται, ἀπέδειξα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν.

Ἵνα δὲ μὴ πρόφασιν ἔχητε λέγειν, ὅτι Ἔδει τὸν Χριστὸν σταυρωθῆναι, ἥ καὶ ἐν τῷ γένει ἡμῶν εἶναι τοὺς παραβαίνοντας, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως ἐδύνατο γένεσθαι· φθάσας διὰ βραχέων εἶπον, ὅτι, βουλόμενος τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἕπεσθαι τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς ἐβουλήθη ποιῆσαι τούτους αὐτεξουσίους πρὸς δικαιοπραξίαν, μετὰ λόγου τοῦ ἐπίστασθαι αὐτοὺς ὑφ' οὗ γεγόνασι καὶ δι' ὃν εἰσι πρότερον οὐκ ὄντες, καὶ μετὰ νόμου τοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κρίνεσθαι, ἐὰν παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον πράττωσι· καὶ δι' ἑαυτοὺς ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐλεγχθησόμεθα πονηρευσάμενοι, ἐὰν μὴ φθάσαντες μεταθώμεθα. Εἰ δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ προμηνύει πάντως τινὰς, καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀνθρώπους, κωλασθήσεσθαι μέλλοντας, διότι προεγίνωσκεν αὐτοὺς ἀμεταβλήτους γενητομένους πονηροὺς, προεῖπε ταῦτα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅτι αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς τοιούτους ἐποίησεν. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 290.

This quibble seems to have found much acceptation with the Jews in Justin's time: for we perceive Celsus, who flourished, like Justin, about the middle of the second century, putting it into the mouth of his personated Jew. See Orig. cont. Cels. lib. ii. p. 72, 73. Spencer. 1618.

annihilate the serpent altogether, rather than place enmity between him and the Seed of the woman; or Why he could not have created the whole race of mankind at once. But, inasmuch as he knew it to be good, he created both angels and men with the power of determining themselves to rectitude of action; and he appointed times, so long as he deemed it good that they should possess this power of Self-determination. And, because he deemed it good, he executed his judgments both general and particular, Self-determination being nevertheless preserved.*

(3.) A third passage, still of the same drift and import, also occurs in the Dialogue with Trypho.

God created both men and angels with possession of a Self-determining Freedom of Preference: so that they might either choose the good, and live eternally; or choose the evil, and incur merited punishment†.

(4.) A fourth passage, yet again of the same tendency, will be found in the first of his two Apologies.

* Ἐὰν δὲ τις ἡμῖν λέγῃ, Μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ὁ Θεὸς μᾶλλον τὸν Ἡρώδην ἀποκτεῖναι; προλαβὼν λέγω, Μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸν ὄφιν ἐξᾶραι τοῦ μὴ εἶναι, καὶ μὴ εἰπεῖν ὅτι καὶ ἔχθραν θήσω ἀναμέσον αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς; Μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἠδύνατο εὐθὺς πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων ποιῆσαι; Ἀλλ', ὡς ἐγίνωσκε καλὸν εἶναι γενέσθαι, ἐποίησεν αὐτεξουσίους πρὸς δικαιοπραξίαν, καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀνθρώπους· καὶ χρόνους ὥρισε, μέχρις οὗ ἐγίνωσκε καλὸν εἶναι τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἔχειν αὐτούς· καὶ, ὅτι καλὸν εἶναι ὁμοίως ἐγνώριζε, καὶ καθολικὰς καὶ μερικὰς κρίσεις ἐποίει, πεφυλαγμένου μέντοι τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 257.

† Βουλόμενος γὰρ τούτους, ἐν ἐλευθέρᾳ προαιρέσει, καὶ αὐτεξουσίους γενομένους, τοὺς τε ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὁ Θεὸς πράττειν, ὅσα ἕκαστον ἐνεδυνάμωσε δύνασθαι ποιεῖν, ἐποίησεν· εἰ μὲν τὰ εὐάρεστα αὐτῷ αἱροῖντο, καὶ ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀτιμωρήτους αὐτοὺς τηρῆσαι· ἐὰν δὲ πονηρεύσωνται, ὡς αὐτῷ δοκεῖ ἕκαστον κολάζειν. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 247.

Lest, from what has been said, some should imagine, that we assert events to occur according to a Fatal Necessity, because those events have been foreknown and predicted: we will also solve this difficulty.

Having learned from the prophets, that both punishments and rewards are assigned according to the deserts of each person's actions, we assert this to be true: for, if it were not so, but if all things happened according to Fate, our Freedom of action would forthwith be destroyed. Thus, if it were fated, that This man should be good, and that man bad; there would be no room either for approbation or for censure: and, again, unless the human race, by a Free Preference, had the power to reject the bad and to choose the good, it would not be the cause of whatever things were done. But, that, by Free Preference, man both does right and does wrong, we thus demonstrate.

The same individual we see passing from one set of actions to their contraries. Now, if it were fated, that he should be, irrecoverably and constrainedly, either bad or good: he would plainly be incapable of these frequent transitions. Consequently, we must either say, that Fate, as the cause of bad, acts contrary to itself: or we must adopt the opinion, that there are no such things as virtue and vice; an opinion, which, as the true word shews, is the height of impiety.*

As, in the former passages, Justin asserted *Man's Freedom of Preference* against the perverse sophistry of the

*"Οπως δὲ μὴ τινες, ἐκ τῶν προλελεγμένων ὑφ' ἡμῶν, δοξάσωσι καθ' εἱμαρμένης ἀνάγκην φάσκειν ἡμᾶς τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ προειπεῖν προεγνωσμένα· καὶ τοῦτο διαλύομεν.

Τὰς τιμωρίας καὶ τὰς κολάσεις καὶ τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἀμοιβὰς, κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεών ἑκάστου ἀποδίδοσθαι, διὰ τῶν προφητῶν μαθόντες, καὶ ἀληθὲς ἀποφαινόμεθα· ἐπεὶ, εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καθ' εἱμαρμένην πάντα γίνεται, οὔτε τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐστιν ὅλως. Εἰ γὰρ εἵμαρται, τὸν δὲ

Jews: so, in the present passage, he argues against the pagan stoical dogma of *Fate* or of *Fixed Uncontroulable Necessity*. Such an opinion, by converting men into mere irresistibly impelled machines, destroys all moral responsibility. Justin, therefore, in opposition to it, contends: that *No man is invincibly forced to act* AGAINST *his will or his choice or his inclination.*

(5.) A fifth passage we read in his second Apology: and here again he is professedly arguing, not against the need of *Divine Grace* in order to willing holiness of life, but simply against the *Absolute Uncontroulable Fatalism* of the Stoics.

The Stoics maintain, that All things are according to a Fatal Necessity. But, because God, in the beginning, created both angels and men in possession of a Power of Self-determination: if they do evil, they will justly, in eternal fire, suffer punishment for their misdeeds. Now, of every intelligent creature, it is the nature, to be capable both of vice and of virtue: for, unless there was a power of spontaneously turning to either, there would be no room for praise.*

τινα ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, καὶ τὸν δὲ φαῦλον· οὔθ' οὗτος ἀποδέκτὸς, οὔδε ἐκεῖνος μεμπτέος. Καὶ αὖ, εἰ μὴ, προαιρέσει ἐλευθέρᾳ, πρὸς τὸ φεύγειν τὰ αἰσχρὰ, καὶ αἱρεῖσθαι τὰ καλὰ, δύναμιν ἔχει τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος· ἀναίτιον ἐστι τῶν ὁπωσδήποτε πραττομένων. Ἀλλ', ὅτι ἐλευθέρᾳ προαιρέσει καὶ κατορθοῖ καὶ σφάλλεται, οὕτως ἀποδείκνυμεν.

Τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον τῶν ἐναντίων τὴν μετέλευσιν ποιοῦμενον ὁρῶμεν. Εἰ δὲ εἵμαρτο ἢ φαῦλον ἢ σπουδαῖον εἶναι, οὐκ ἂν ποτε τῶν ἐναντίων δεκτικὸς ἦν, καὶ πλειστάκις μετετίθετο· ἀλλ' οὐδ' οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σπουδαῖοι, οἱ δὲ φαῦλοι, ἐπει τὴν εἱμαρμένην αἰτίαν φαύλων καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτῇ πράττουσαν ἀποφαινόμεθα· ἢ ἐκεῖνο τὸ προειρημένον δόξαι ἀληθὲς εἶναι, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐστιν ἀρετὴ οὐδὲ κακία, ἀλλὰ δόξῃ μόνον ἢ ἀγαθὰ ἢ κακὰ νομίζεται· ἥπερ, ὡς δείκνυσιν ὁ ἀληθὴς λόγος, μεγίστη ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία ἐστὶν. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 62, 63.

* Οἱ Στωϊκοὶ, καθ' εἱμαρμένης ἀνάγκην, πάντα γίνεσθαι ἀπεφήναντο. Ἀλλ', ὅτι αὐτεξούσιον τὸ τε τῶν ἀγγέλων γένος καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν

3. Thus argues Justin against the dogma of *Fatal Uncontroulable Necessity*, whether sophistically employed by the Jews, or mischievously advocated by the Stoics. I have now to shew, that, in thus contending for *Man's Freedom of Choice or Preference*, he by no means contended on the pelagian principle that *Divine influential Grace is unnecessary*, but, on the contrary, that he upheld *The need of Divine Grace in order to man's choosing or preferring a life of holiness rather than a life of unholiness.*

The most satisfactory mode of conducting my proof is simply to adduce Justin's own precise declarations.

It is not my business to pronounce sentence, by anticipation, upon any one of the race of you Jews. But, so far as this, I certainly must assert. If any one be saved, he must be of the number of those who can be saved through the Grace which is from the Lord of hosts.*

We must all hope in God, the Creator of all things: and, from him alone, we must seek salvation and assistance. But we must not, like other men who are ignorant of Christianity, fancy: that we are saved, on account either of our descent or of our strength or of our wisdom†.

ἀρχὴν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίως, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἂν πλημμελήσωσι, τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐν αἰωνίῳ πύρι κομίσονται· γεννητοῦ δὲ παντὸς ἥδε ἡ φύσις, κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἄν ἦν ἐπαινετὸν οὐδὲν αὐτῶν, εἰ οὐκ ἦν ἐπ' ἀμφότερα τρέπεσθαι, καὶ δύναμιν εἶχε. Justin. Apol. ii. Oper. p. 35.

* Οὐ φθάνω ἀποφαίνεσθαι περὶ οὐδενὸς τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν, εἰ μὴ τις ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπὸ Κυρίου σαβαὼθ σωθῆναι δυνάμενος. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 224.

† Ἐπὶ Θεὸν τὸν πάντα ποιήσαντα ἐλπίζειν δεῖ πάντας, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου μόνου σωτηρίαν καὶ βοηθειαν ζητεῖν· ἀλλὰ μὴ, ὡς τοὺς λοιποὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, διὰ γένος ἢ πλοῦτον ἢ ἰσχὺν ἢ σοφίαν, νομίζειν δύνασθαι σώζεσθαι. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 257.

Solely from the wonderful foreknowledge of God it has happened, that, through the vocation of the new and eternal covenant, we Christians are found to be more wise and more pious than you Jews: who imagine yourselves to be both lovers of God and possessors of wisdom; but who, in truth, are neither the one nor the other.*

Wherefore to us it has been given, that we should both hear and understand and be saved through Christ†.

II. If the character of Justin be not already cleared, we may bring to his assistance, both Irenèus who was instructed by Polycarp the disciple of St. John, and Augustine himself whose soundness on the doctrine of *Divine Grace* Mr. Milner would have been the last person to dispute.

Both these eminent men were placed in situations similar to that of Justin: and the natural consequence was, that they each argued and theologised precisely as Justin argued and theologised.

1. The great Work of Irenèus was directed against the various early modifications of Gnosticism. Now the Gnostics held a species of *Fatalism*, which exonerated even the most depraved individuals from all moral and religious responsibility: for they taught, that bad men committed wickedness, not by a free though perverse preference of evil to good, but by a Fatal Necessity inherent in their very nature, which left them no room for choice and which compelled them to unholiness even if it were against their inclination.

* Θαυμαστῇ προνοίᾳ Θεοῦ τοῦτο γέγονεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς, ὑμῶν τῶν νομιζομένων, οὐκ ὄντων δὲ, οὔτε φιλοθέων οὔτε συνετῶν, συνετώτεροι καὶ θεοσεβέστεροι εὑρεθῶμεν, διὰ τῆς κλήσεως τῆς καινῆς καὶ αἰωνίου διαθήκης, τουτέστι, τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 271.

† Ἡμῖν οὖν ἐδόθη, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι, καὶ συνεῖναι, καὶ σωθῆναι, διὰ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 274.

(1.) Such being the heretics whom Irenèus had to oppose, we shall not wonder to find him adopting the precise reasoning and even the precise phraseology of Justin: not, however, because he was anticipating Pelagius in a denial of the necessity of *Divine Grace;* but merely because he was condemning a *Fatalism*, which was plainly destructive of all religion.

Man, being endowed with reason, and in this respect being similar to God, possesses Freedom of Will and a Self-determining Power. Hence he himself is the cause to himself, that he becomes, sometimes good corn, and sometimes mere straw. Wherefore, also, he will be justly condemned: because, being created with the faculty of reason, he has lost true reason; and, living unreasonably, he has opposed the justice of God.*

God made man free from the beginning, having his own power of Self-determination even as he has his own soul: in order that he may submit to God's behests voluntarily; and not, on the part of God, constrainedly. For God uses force to no one: though, to man, God's righteous behests are always present. And, on this account, he influentially gives good counsel to all. In man, as well as in the angels, he placed a power of choice†.

The Light, with a mighty necessity, will subject no one to

* Homo vero rationabilis, et secundum hoc similis Deo, liber in arbitrio factus est et suæ potestatis (Gr. procul dubio αὐτεξούσιος), ipse sibi causa est, ut aliquando quidem frumentum, aliquando palea, fiat. Quapropter et justè condemnabitur, quoniam, rationabilis factus, amisit veram rationem; et, irrationabiliter vivens, adversatus est justitiæ Dei. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 9. p. 238.

† Liberum eum Deus fecit ab initio, habentem suam potestatem (Gr. αὐτεξούσιον) sicut et suam animam, ad utendum sententia Dei voluntariè, et non coactum a Deo. Vis enim a Deo non fit: sed bona sen-

itself: nor does God compel him, who is unwilling to abide in holiness. Those persons, therefore, who have departed from the Paternal Light and who have transgressed the law of liberty, have departed by their own fault, having been created in the possession of Free Will and of a Self-determining Power of Preference.*

(2.) Thus argues Irenèus against the *Fatalism* of the Gnostics: but, while he thus argues, we must not rapidly conclude, that, on the topic of *Divine Grace*, he is anticipatively pelagianising. Like his contemporary Justin, he maintains the necessity of *Divine Grace:* though he denies, that, against their own *choice* and *inclination*, the wicked are *fatally compelled* to evil.

As the dry earth gives not its produce without the due watering of the natural rain: so we likewise, being at first mere dry wood, should never bring forth living fruit without the free allegorical rain which is from above†.

Christ it is, who causes us to serve him in righteousness and holiness all our days: and the Spirit it is, who prepares us to become the sons of God, that so the Son may conduct us

tentia adest illi semper. Et, propter hoc, consilium quidem bonum dat omnibus. Posuit enim in homine potestatem electionis, quemadmodum et in angelis. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 71. p. 305, 306.

* Neque lumen, cum magna necessitate, subjiciet sibi quenquam: neque Deus cogit eum, qui nolit continere ejus artem. Qui igitur abstiterunt a paterno lumine et transgressi sunt legem libertatis, per suam abstiterunt culpam, liberi arbitrii et suæ potestatis (Gr. αὐτεξούσιοι) facit. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 76. p. 312.

† Sicut arida terra, si non percipiat humorem, non fructificat: sic et nos, lignum aridum existentes primum, nunquam fructicaremus vitam, sine superna voluntaria pluvia. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iii. c. 19. p. 207.

*to the Father, and that so the Spirit may give us an incorruptibility to eternal life**.

By the Spirit of God, man is both quickened and increased†.

2. Equally strong, respecting *Free Will*, is the language even of Augustine himself. But then, in his own account of the design of his several Treatises on *Grace and Free Will* and on *Correction and Grace* and on *Nature and Grace*, he fully explains its real drift and purport.

The Treatise on *Grace and Free Will* he wrote, for the benefit of those persons, who, when the Grace of God is defended, fancying that Free Will is thereby denied, so take up the defence of Free Will as to deny the Grace of God‡.

The Treatise on *Correction and Grace* he wrote, because it had been declared, that *No one ought to be punished for not obeying God's commandments*§.

The Treatise on *Nature and Grace* he wrote against Pe-

* Dominus noster Jesus Christus,—faciens nos servire sibi in sanctitate et justitia omnes dies nostros :—Spiritu quidem præparante hominem in filium Dei, Filio autem adducente ad Patrem, Patre autem incorruptelam donante in æternam vitam. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 37. p. 267.

† Spiritus Dei vivificat et auget hominem. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 37. p. 269.

‡ Propter eos, qui, cum defenditur Dei gratia, putantes negari liberum arbitrium, sic ipsi defendunt liberum arbitrium, ut negent Dei gratiam, asserentes eam secundum merita nostra dari ; scripsi librum, cujus titulus est *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*. Argum. in August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. ex Retract. lib. ii. c. 66. Oper. vol. vii. p. 459.

§ Rursus ad eosdem scripsi alterum librum, quem *De Correptione et Gratia* prænotavi, cum mihi nunciatum esset, dixisse ibi quendam, Neminem corripiendum, si Dei præcepta non facit, sed, pro illo ut faciat, tantummodo orandum. Argum. in August. de Corrept. et Grat. ex Retract. lib. ii. c. 67. Oper. vol. vii. p. 471.

lagius, who had so asserted the goodness of man's nature and will, as to deny the necessity of Divine Grace*.

Thus circumstanced, it was obviously the business of Augustine to maintain the necessity of *Divine Grace*, without running into the Manichèan error of *Fatalism*. In other words, as Justin and Irenèus had done before him, it was his business to insist, concurrently with *Divine Grace*, upon *Man's Freedom of Mental Preference*.

With these explanatory remarks before us, we shall hear, without any alarm for the interests of Christian Truth, Augustine employing exactly the same language as that, on the strength of which Mr. Milner has so hastily charged Justin with pelagianising.

Precepts of charity would vainly be given to man, unless he possessed Freedom of Will†.

We must, in no wise, suppose Free Will to be taken away, because we read in Scripture: It is God, that worketh in you, both to will and to do, of his good pleasure‡.

God, in Scripture, has plainly revealed to us, that Man possesses Free Will: for the divine precepts would be nugatory, unless man possessed Freedom of Will; so that, by

* Venit etiam tunc in manus meas quidam Pelagii liber, ubi hominis naturam, contra Dei gratiam qua justificatur impius et qua Christiani sumus, quanta potuit argumentatione defendit. Librum ergo, quo huic respondi defendens gratiam, non contra naturam, sed per quam natura liberatur et regitur; *De Natura et Gratia* nuncupavi. Argum. in August. de Nat. et Grat. ex Retract. lib. ii. c. 42. Oper. vol. vii. p. 278.

† Hæc ergo præcepta charitatis inaniter darentur hominibus, non habentibus liberum arbitrium. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 18. Oper. vol. vii. p. 466.

‡ Non enim, quia dixit; *Deus est enim, qui operatur in vobis et velle et operari pro bona voluntate:* ideo liberum arbitrium abstulisse putandus est. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 9. Oper. vol. vii. p. 463.

performing the divine precepts, he might attain to the promised rewards.*

We must acknowledge, that we possess Free Will to do both good and evil: but, in doing evil, each person is free from righteousness and is the servant of sin; while, in doing good, no person can be free, unless he shall have been freed by him who said, If the Son shall make you free, then shall you be free indeed†.

God created us possessed of Free Will; nor are we, by any Fatal Necessity, drawn either to virtue or to vice: for, where there is Fatal Necessity, there is no crown‡.

III. The key to the whole matter, in short, is simply this.

Like many other persons, Mr. Milner has not sufficiently distinguished, between *The Free Will of Spontaneous Mental Preference*, and *The Good Will of freely preferring Virtue to Vice.*

By the ancients, on the contrary, who were frequently

* Revelavit autem nobis, per Scripturas suas sanctas, esse in homine liberum voluntatis arbitrium:—quia ipsa divina præcepta homini non prodessent, nisi haberet liberum voluntatis arbitrium, quo ea faciens ad promissa præmia perveniret. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 459.

† Liberum itaque arbitrium, et ad malum et ad bonum faciendum, confitendum est nos habere: sed, in malo faciendo, liber est quisque justitiæ servusque peccati; in bono autem, liber esse nullus potest, nisi fuerit liberatus ab eo qui dixit, *Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc verè liberi eritis.* August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 1. Oper. vol. vii. p. 471.

‡ Item quod ait a memorato dictum esse presbytero (scil. Hieronymo); *Liberi arbitrii nos condidit Deus, nec ad virtutem nec ad vitia necessitate trahimur; alioquin, ubi necessitas, nec corona est:* quis non agnoscat? Quis non toto corde suscipiat? Quis aliter conditam humanam neget esse naturam? Sed, in rectè faciendo, ideo nullum est vinculum necessitatis, quia libertas est charitatis. August. de Nat. et Grat. cont. Pelag. c. 65. Oper. vol. vii. p. 289.

called upon to oppose the mischievous impiety of *Fatalism* while yet they stood pledged to maintain the vital doctrine of *Divine Grace*, this distinction was well known and carefully observed.

The Manichèans so denied Free Will, as to hold a *Fatal Necessity* of sinning, whether the *Choice* of the individual did or did not go along with the action*.

The Pelagians so held Free Will, as to deny the *Need of Divine Grace* to make that Free Will a Good Will†.

By the Catholics, each of these Systems was alike rejected. They held, that *Man possesses Free Will:* for, otherwise, he could not be an accountable subject of God's moral government. But they also held, that, *In consequence of the fall, his Free Will was a Bad Will:* whence, with a perfect conscious freedom of *Choice* or *Preference*, and without any violence put upon his *Inclination*, he, perpetually, though quite spontaneously, *prefers* unholiness to holiness; and thus

* Dicunt illi Manichæi: quia, primi hominis peccato, id est, Adæ, liberum arbitrium perierit; et nemo jam potestatem habeat bene vivendi, sed omnes in peccatum carnis suæ necessitate cogantur. Julian. Pelag. apud August. cont. Duas Epist. Pelag. lib. iv. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 400.

Οὐκ ἐχρῆν οὖν τὸν ἀποκρινάμενον πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς μέγιστον κακὸν ἔχοντα τὸν λόγον, πρὸς τὸ κατὰ τοὺς Μανιχαίους μέγιστον κακὸν ἀποτείνεσθαι· ἀγνοίας γὰρ τοῦτο σημεῖον, καὶ ἀπορίας ἐλέγχου, καθὰ εἴρηται. Συγχωρεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς πράττειν ἃ ἑκουσίως αἱρούμεθα κακὰ, οὐ διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὸ ἡμῶν αὐθαίρετον, καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ μακρόθυμον, δειχθῇ· ὧν χωρὶς, οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἄνθρωποι, οὔτε αὐτὸς, ἀγαθὸς ἐνεδέχετο εἶναι ἐπὶ τῆς παρούσης κατασστάσεως. Quæst. et Respons. ad Græc. in Justin. Oper. p. 127.

† Sunt enim quidam tantum præsumentes de libero humanæ voluntatis arbitrio, ut, ad non peccandum, nec adjuvandos nos divinitus opinentur, semel ipsi naturæ nostræ concesso liberæ voluntatis arbitrio. August. de Peccat. Merit. et Remiss. lib. ii. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 263.

requires the aid of Divine Grace to make his Bad Will a Good Will.

1. To this purpose, again and again, speaks Augustine: and to this same purpose, Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius and Cyprian and Tertullian and Tatian and Theophilus of Antioch had similarly spoken before him.

(1.) Let us hear Augustine.

To live well and to act well, there is in man a freedom of will: but there are also divine testimonies, that, without the Grace of God, we can do no good thing.*

Free Will is always in us: but Good Will is not always in us. For either the will is free from righteousness, when it serves sin: and then it is bad. Or it is free from sin, when it serves righteousness: and then it is good†.

We certainly may, if we will, keep God's commandments: but, because the preparation of the will is from the Lord, we must beg of him, that we may will so much as suffices us to do

* Sicut superioribus testimoniis Scripturarum probavimus sanctarum, ad bene vivendum et rectè agendum esse in homine liberum voluntatis arbitrium: sic etiam, de gratia Dei, sine qua nihil boni agere possumus, quæ sint divina testimonia, videamus.—Dictum est libero arbitrio; *Fili, noli deficere a disciplina Domini:* et Dominus dicit; *Ego rogavi pro te, Petre, ne deficiat fides tua.* Homo, ergo, gratia juvatur; ne, sine causa, voluntati ejus jubeatur. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 4. Oper. vol. vii. p. 460, 461.

† Semper est autem in nobis voluntas libera, sed non semper est bona. Aut enim a justitia libera est, quando servit peccato; et tunc est mala: aut a peccato libera est, quando servit justitiæ; et tunc est bona. Gratia vero Dei semper est bona: et per hanc fit, ut sit homo bonæ voluntatis, qui prius fuit voluntatis malæ. Per hanc etiam fit, ut ipsa bona voluntas, quæ jam esse cœpit, augeatur, et tam magna fiat, ut possit implere divina mandata quæ voluerit, cum valdè perfectèque voluerit. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 15. Oper. vol. vii. p. 464.

by willing. Assuredly, we will, when we will: but he causes, that we should will what is good.*

The human will is not taken away by the Grace of God; but it is changed from a Bad Will into a Good Will: and, when it has become a Good Will, it is assisted†.

(2.) Let us hear Cyril of Jerusalem.

Our Self-determining Free Will is evil, though it acts by a Free Choice: for, when we sin, it is by a deliberate Preference of evil to good. The Creator is holy: but the creature, by his own proper Choice, has turned to bitterness‡.

(3.) Let us hear Athanasius.

After the fall, man's soul, deeming pleasure to be good, abuses the very name of goodness by applying it to pleasure. Henceforth, it no longer moves according to virtue or with any regard to God: but, highly esteeming worthless things, it abusively chooses them; inasmuch as it possesses the Self-determination of Free Will. For, as it can incline to what is good, so likewise it can decline from what is good. Yet, when it declines from what is good, it does so through a Free Preference and a Distinct Estimation of the contrary§.

* Certum est enim nos mandata servare, si volumus: sed, quia præparatur voluntas a Domino, ab illo petendum est, ut tantum velimus quantum sufficit ut volendo faciamus. Certum est, nos velle cum volumus: sed ille facit, ut velimus bonum. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 16. Oper. vol. vii. p. 465.

† Gratiam Dei,—qua voluntas humana non tollitur, sed ex mala mutatur in bonam; et, cum bona fuerit, adjuvatur. August. de Grat. et Liber. Arbit. c. 20. Oper. vol. vii. p. 466.

‡ Κακὸν αὐτεξούσιον, βλάσθημα προαιρέσεως· καὶ, ὅτι γε αὐτοπροαιρέτως ἁμαρτάνομεν, λέγει ποῦ σαφῶς ὁ προφήτης.—Ὁ μὲν οὖν κτίστης ἀγαθὸς, ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, ἔκτισεν· τὸ δὲ κτισθὲν, ἐξ οἰκείας προαιρέσεως, εἰς πικρίαν ἐτράπη. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. ii. p. 5.

§ Ἀποστᾶσα (ἡ ψυχὴ) τῆς τῶν νοητῶν θεωρίας, καὶ ταῖς κατὰ μέρος

(4.) Let us hear Cyprian.

Heresies arise from the restlessness of the Perverted Mind. But the Lord suffers this to occur, Freedom of Choice meantime remaining.*

(5.) Let us hear Tertullian.

Man is disposed to good, not, by nature, but by institution. He possesses not, as his own, the faculty of being good: because he is disposed to good, not by nature, but by institution, according to his good teacher, who of good men is the builder†.

(6.) Let us hear Tatian, the pupil of Justin.

Each branch of the intelligent creation, angelic and human, has been made with a power of Self-determination: yet not having the nature of goodness, save only from God‡.

τοῦ σώματος ἐνεργείαις καταχρωμένη, καὶ ἡσθεῖσα τῇ τοῦ σώματος θεωρίᾳ, καὶ ἰδοῦσα καλὸν ἑαυτῇ εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν, πλανηθεῖσα κατεχρήσατο τῷ τοῦ καλοῦ ὀνόματι, καὶ ἐνόμισεν εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν αὐτὸ τὸ ὄντως καλὸν·—ἐρασθεῖσα δὲ τῆς ἡδονῆς, ποικίλως αὐτὴν ἐνεργεῖν ἤρξατο. Οὖσα γὰρ τὴν φύσιν εὐκίνητος, εἰ καὶ τὰ καλὰ ἀπεστράφη, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κινεῖσθαι οὐ παυέται. Κινεῖται οὖν, οὐκ ἔτι μὲν κατὰ ἀρετὴν, οὐδὲ ὥστε τὸν Θεὸν ὁρᾶν· ἀλλὰ, τὰ μὴ ὄντα λογιζομένη, τὸ ἑαυτῆς δυνατὸν μεταποιεῖ, καταχρωμένη τούτῳ εἰς ἃς ἐπενόησεν ἐπιθυμίας· ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτεξούσιος γέγονε. Δύναται γὰρ, ὥσπερ πρὸς τὰ καλὰ νεύειν, οὕτω καὶ τὰ καλὰ ἀποστρέφεσθαι. Ἀποστρεφομένη δὲ τὸ καλὸν, πάντως τὰ ἐναντία λογίζεται. Athan. cont. Gent. Orat. Oper. vol. p. 3, 4.

* Hinc hæreses et factæ sunt frequenter, et fiunt, dum perversa mens non habet pacem, dum perfidia discordans non tenet unitatem. Fieri vero hæc Dominus permittit et patitur, manente propriæ libertatis arbitrio. Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles. Oper. vol. i. p. 111.

† Homo—non natura in bonum dispositus est, sed institutione, non suum habens *Bonus esse*, quia non natura in bonum dispositus est, sed institutione, secundum institutorem bonum, scilicet bonorum conditiorem. Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib. ii. § 4. Oper. p. 174.

‡ Τὸ δὲ ἑκάτερον τῆς ποιήσεως εἶδος αὐτεξούσιον γέγονε, τἀγαθοῦ φύσιν μὴ ἔχον, πλὴν μόνον παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Tatian. Orat. cont. Græc. ad calc. Oper. Justin. Martyr. p. 146.

(7.) Let us, finally, hear Theophilus of Antioch.

God created man, with the possession of Freedom, and with a power of Self-determination. The Freedom, therefore, which he claimed to himself through neglect and disobedience, God now, through his own philanthropy and mercy, gives unto him, that men should thus be obedient.*

2. On the present point, the doctrine, taught by Augustine and the ancients, is precisely that which is maintained by the Reformers of our Anglican Church.

Those venerable and well-informed Moderns resolve not our evil actions into the compulsory *Fatal Necessity* of Manicheism, on the one hand: nor, on the other hand, according to the presumptuous Scheme of Pelagianism, do they claim for us *A Spontaneous Choice or Preference of good independently of the Divine Assistance.*

The *simple* Freedom of Man's Will, so that, whatever he chooses, he chooses, not *against* his inclination, but through a direct and conscious internal *preference* of the thing chosen to the thing rejected: this *simple* Freedom of Man's Will they deny not.

But, while they acknowledge the *simple* Freedom of Man's Will, they assert the *quality* of its choice or preference to be so perverted by the fall and to be so distorted by the influence of original sin, that, in order to his choosing the good and rejecting the evil, the Grace of God, by Christ, must both make his Bad Will a Good Will, and must also still continue to coöperate with him even when that Goodness of the Will shall have been happily obtained.

* Ἐλεύθερον γὰρ καὶ αὐτεξούσιον ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Ὃ οὖν ἑαυτῷ περιεποιήσατο δι' ἀμελείας καὶ παρακοῆς, τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ νυνὶ δωρεῖται, διὰ ἰδίας φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης, ὑπακούοντας αὐτῷ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Theoph. ad Autol. lib. ii. ad calc. Oper. Justin. Martyr. p. 103.

In the tenth Article of the English Church, it is often, I believe, not sufficiently observed, that our minutely accurate Reformers do not say: that *The Grace of God, in the work of conversion, gives us* FREE WILL, as if we were previously subject to a Fatal Necessity; but only that *The Grace of God, by Christ, prevents us that we may have a* GOOD WILL, *and coöperates with us when we have that* GOOD WILL.

The doctrine, in short, of the English Church, when she defines, that *Fallen man cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to Faith and Calling upon God*, is not; that We really *prefer* the spiritual life to the animal life, and are at the same time by a Fatal Necessity *prevented* from embracing it: but it is; that We *prefer* the animal life to the spiritual life, and through the badness of our perverse will shall *continue* to prefer it, until (as the Article speaks) *the Grace of God shall prevent us that we may have a Good Will*, or until (as Holy Scripture speaks) *the people of the Lord shall be willing in the day of his power**.

3. Highly as I respect the memory of Mr. Milner, and

* The same doctrine, which at once rejects Manichèan Necessity and Pelagian Self-Sufficiency, is propounded and discussed at considerable length, in the ancient Work denominated *Hypognostics:* a Work which has been ascribed, though (I believe) erroneously, to Augustine. See Hypognost. cont. Pelag. lib. iii. ad calc. August. Oper. vol. vii. p. 24–29.

Some persons would distinguish between *Natural Free Will* and *Moral Free Will:* allowing the former, but denying the latter, to man after the fall. Part of the reasoning in the *Hypognostics* looks very much this way. See Hypog. lib. iii. c. 4.

The difference seems to be immaterial: for it is rather a verbal difference of statement, than an actual difference of sentiment. By *Our not possessing Moral Free Will*, is simply, I suppose, meant: that, *In our fallen condition, though we may abstain from an outward act of sin, such as theft or adultery or murder, we cannot force ourselves cordially to love and actually to prefer the spiritual life to the animal life.* But this is virtually equivalent to the definition of our tenth Article: that *Fallen*

much as in many points I deem his Ecclesiastical History valuable; still I feel it only an act of justice thus to vindicate

man cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to Faith and Calling upon God.

I am perfectly aware of the difficulty, on this point, which is often started by Calvinists: *If God offers the privilege of a Good Will equally to* ALL, *and if his prevenient Grace equally in* ALL *cases attends upon the offer of this privilege, why, in matter of fact, have not* ALL *equally a Good Will?*

No person, I apprehend, will affect to deny the existence of this difficulty: yet those, I think, who start it, as compelling us, by no very large circle of consequences, to adopt the Calvinistic Theory of Election, would do well to solve yet another difficulty which forthwith presents itself.

If Adam, at his creation, received a Free Will which was a Good Will: and if the Grace of God constantly coöperated with him in the exercise of that Free Good Will: how came he to fall away from a Good Will to a Bad Will; a circumstance, which must have occurred, when, at the time of the fall, he freely preferred the evil to the good?

I merely offer this reply to shew, that *A matter may, in itself, be perfectly true, though* WE *may be unable either to explain or to comprehend its rationalè.*

Certainly, in point of fact, the primitive Church held conjointly, the doctrine of *Man's Free though Bad Will*, and the doctrine of *The Need of God's Grace to make that Bad Free Will a Good Free Will:* yet the doctrine of *Election as explained by Augustine and Calvin* was totally unknown in the primitive Church anterior to the fifth century.

My object, however, is purely *An Historical Inquiry*, not *The achievement of a Metaphysical Solution of difficulties.* For the former, industry and accuracy may sufficiently qualify any man: to the latter, I presume not to deem myself equal.

I subjoin the excellent Helvetic Statement of Free Will, as it exists in man after the Fall.

Considerandum est qualis fuerit homo post lapsum. Non sublatus est quidem homini intellectus; non erepta est ei voluntas; et prorsus in lapidem vel truncum est commutatus: cæterum illa ita sunt immutata et imminuta in homine, ut non possint amplius quod potuerunt ante lapsum. Intellectus enim obscuratus est: voluntas vero, ex libera, facta est voluntas serva. Nam servit peccato, non nolens, sed volens. Etenim *voluntas*, non *noluntas*, dicitur. Ergo, quoad malum sive peccatum,

a pious primitive martyr from the charge of having been the first to introduce into christian ground the foreign plant of independent pelagianising Free Will: Free Will, that is to say, so *essentially* and so *inherently* good, as to require no communication of Divine Grace to *make* it good, and no concurrence of Divine Grace aidingly to work with it when it *is* good.

Purely, then, under the aspect of a FACT established by competent evidence, *Free Will*, in the reprehensible and unscriptural form of *A denial of our need both of God's Preventing Grace and of God's Assisting Grace*, Justin, I believe, held no more than Augustine.

homo non coactus vel a Deo vel a Diabolo, sed sua sponte, malum facit; et, hac parte, liberrimi est arbitrii. Quod vero non raro cernimus pessima hominis facinora et consilia impediri a Deo, ne finem suum consequantur, non tollit homini libertatem in malo; sed Deus potentia sua prævenit, quod homo alias liberè instituit.—In regeneratione, intellectus illuminatur per Spiritum Sanctum, ut et mysteria et voluntatem Dei intelligat. Et voluntas ipsa non tantum mutatur per Spiritum, sed etiam instruitur facultatibus, ut sponte velit et possit bonum.—Damnamus in hac causa Manichæos, qui negant homini bono, ex libero arbitrio, fuisse initium mali. Confess. Helvet. sect. ix. Syllog. Confess. p. 31, 32, 33.

The whole question of *God's Foreknowledge and Man's Free Will* is very well discussed by Augustine in his Work de Civit. Dei. lib. v. c. 9, 10. Oper. vol. v. p. 53, 54.

CHAPTER XII.

GENERAL RESULT AND CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now, purely in the way of historical testimony, come to the result: that *The several doctrinal Systems, usually denominated* Arminianism *and* Nationalism *and* Calvinism, *were alike unknown to that earliest Church Catholic, which conversed either with the Apostles or with the disciples of the Apostles, and which by them personally was instructed in the real articles of the Christian Faith.*

But, from this result, unless I greatly mistake, the inevitable conclusion will be: that *Neither the Arminian System nor the Nationalising System nor the Calvinistic System exhibits the mind of the sincere Gospel.*

I. In revealed religion, by the very nature and necessity of things, as Tertullian well teaches us: *Whatever is first, is true; whatever is later, is adulterate.*

If a doctrine, *totally unknown* to the Primitive Church which received her Theology immediately from the hands of the Apostles and which continued long to receive it from the hands of the disciples of the Apostles, springs up in a *subsequent* age, let that age be the fifth century or let it be the tenth century or let it be the sixteenth century: such doctrine stands, on its very front, impressed with the brand of mere *human* invention.

Hence, in the language of Tertullian, it is *adulterate:* and hence, with whatever ingenuity it may be abstractedly defended, and with whatever plausibility it may be fetched out of a particular interpretation of Scripture, and with whatever practical piety on the part of its advocates it may

be attended; we cannot, *evidentially*, admit it to be part and parcel of the divine revelation of Christianity.

The bare innocence, or even the eminent holiness, of a *new* doctrine, is no proof of its *truth*. On the contrary, the very circumstance of its *newness* stamps it with the reprobating mark of *falsehood*. In strictness of speech, a doctrine, thus delivered, is nothing better, than the mere unauthorised opinion of a certain individual or of certain individuals. So far from resting upon any tangible evidence, the decisive testimony of Ecclesiastical Antiquity is directly against it. If it were indeed a *genuine* apostolical doctrine, it would have been held and maintained and delivered by the Catholic Church *from the very beginning:* nor would it have been left for the *late discovery* of some insulated individual, who flourished at an era long posterior. But it is convicted of *Novelty:* and, THEREFORE, it is *adulterate*. Those, who advocate it, may, indeed, devoutly *believe* it to be true: but some one or other mere uninspired and thence mere unauthoritative individual is, after all, its quite unsatisfactory *inventor*.

II. Among unread or halfread persons of our present somewhat confident age, it is a not uncommon saying: that THEY *disregard the early Fathers;* and that THEY *will abide by nothing save the decision of Scripture alone.*

1. If, by *A disregard of the early Fathers*, they mean, that they allow them not individually that personal authority in exposition which the Romanists claim for them; they certainly will not have *me*, at least, for an opponent: and, accordingly, I have shewn, that, in the interpretation of the scriptural terms *Election* and *Predestination*, I regard the insulated individual authority of Augustine just as little, as I regard the insulated individual authority of Calvin*.

* On this point, nothing can be more absurd, than the second of the

But, if, by *A disregard of the early Fathers*, they mean, that they regard them not as evidence to the FACT of *what* doctrines were or were not received by the Primitive Church and from her were or were not delivered to posterity; they might just as rationally talk of the surpassing wisdom of extinguishing the light of History by way of more effectually improving and increasing our knowledge of past events: for, in truth, under the aspect in which they are specially important to *us*, the early Fathers are neither more nor less than so many historical witnesses.

2. Again: if, by *An abiding solely by the decision of Scripture*, they mean, that, as a binding or authoritative

supplementary articles, appended to the Nicene Creed in the Profession of the Tridentine Faith sanctioned by the Bull of Pope Pius IV.

The unfortunate subscriber is required to declare, that *He will never receive and interpret Scripture, save according to the* UNANIMOUS *consent of the Fathers.*

Now, if, by the term *Fathers*, we understand, with the Romanists, those numerous ecclesiastical writers, of whom the Roman Clement was chronologically the first, and Bernard chronologically the last; the article before us requires *a plain impossibility:* for, as corruption gradually crept into the Church, *varieties* of interpretation attended upon it. Hence, in erecting the Fathers into a sort of infallible teachers, the Church of Rome has ridiculously determined *the accomplishment of an impossibility* to be an article of faith.

But the folly of intimating, by implication, that *All the Fathers, from Clement down to Bernard, are* UNANIMOUS *in their interpretation of Scripture, when, even in the exposition of the famous text Matt. xvi.* 18, *there is a marked and thorough* DIVERSITY (See my Difficult. of Romanism, book i. chap. 3. § IV. 1.): this folly does not authorise us to run, as some apparently have done, into the contrary extreme, by denying to the *early* Fathers the character of valuable witnesses to the faith of the *early* Church. *Here* the truth is, that, in *all* the really catholic doctrines, so far from there being perpetual discrepance, there is a most remarkable and satisfactory concord. The reader will find a striking example of this description, in the interpretation of the texts, now litigated between Catholics and Socinians, by the early Antenicene Fathers. See my Apostol. of Trinitar. Append. I. numb. 1.

rule of Faith, they will receive nothing save what is contained in Scripture; no person, I suppose, who rejects that idle supplemental tradition which the Council of Trent invites us to receive with the *same* confidence as Holy Scripture itself, will think of differing from them: for the Bible, and the Bible alone, is doubtless the Rule of Faith with all Protestants*.

But, if, by *An abiding solely by the decision of Scripture*, they mean, that, utterly disregarding the recorded Doctrinal System of that Primitive Church which conversed with and was taught by the Apostles, they will abide by nothing save *their own* crude and arbitrary private expositions of Scripture; we certainly may well admire their intrepidity, whatever we may think of their modesty: for, in truth, by such a plan, while they call upon us to despise the sentiments of Christian Antiquity so far as we can learn them upon distinct historical testimony, they expect us to receive, without hesitation and as undoubted verities, *their own* mere modern upstart speculations upon the sense of God's holy word; that is to say, the evidence of the early Fathers and the hermeneutic decisions of the Primitive Church we may laudably and profitably contemn, but *themselves* we must receive (for they themselves are content to receive themselves) as well nigh certain and infallible expositors of Scripture†.

* Traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, PARI pietatis affectu ac reverentia, suscipit et veneratur. Concil. Trident. sess. iv. p. 7, 8.

† In this statement, I conceive myself to speak the language of plain common sense; and I, furthermore, assuredly speak that of the Anglican Church and her ablest doctors or supporters.

Bishop Bull, after first adducing the explicit decision of the English

III. The advocates either of Arminianism or of Nationalism do not, I believe, attach that vital importance to their respective Systems, which the advocate of Calvinism is wont to attach to his own favourite Scheme. Omitting, therefore, the two former Systems, inasmuch as any such discussion would in their case be irrelevant, I shall proceed to point out, both the incongruous result which springs from the frequently exaggerated importance of Calvinism, and likewise the practical error of rating that importance so high as to make the System itself absolutely essential to the comfort and satisfaction of every real Christian.

1. In regard to the first of these two matters, the very importance attached to the peculiarities of Calvinism, when united with the total want of historical evidence that it was the doctrine of the Primitive Apostolic Church, brings out a result most strangely wild and incongruous.

The doctrines of Grace, says the late Mr. Romaine in his commendatory preface to a new edition of A Practical Discourse of God's Sovereignty by Elisha Coles: *The doctrines of Grace, of which this book treats, are the truths of God. Our author has defended them in a masterly manner. He has not only proved them to be plainly revealed in the Scriptures: but he has also shewn, that they are of such constant use to the children of God, that, without the stedfast belief of them, they cannot go on their way rejoicing. It is from these doctrines only, that settled peace can rule in the conscience, the love of God be maintained in the heart, and a conversation kept up in our walk and warfare as becometh the Gospel. It is from them, that all good works proceed,*

Church, goes on to cite the parallel determinations of a host of our older divines: and then sums up the matter, by adding the mighty weight of his own deliberate adhesion. See Apol. pro Harmon. sect. i. § 4, 5, 6.

and that all fruits of holiness abound to the praise of the Glory and Grace of God.

In the practical view of these points, Elisha Coles is singularly excellent. He has brought these deep things into daily use, and has proved them to be absolutely necessary in daily experience. They are truths, and useful truths. On these two accounts, his book has been greatly esteemed by real Christians: and, on these, I would recommend it, as approved, in my own judgment, to be agreeable to the Oracles of God, and as found to be of such constant use, that, until I received them, I could not enjoy the blessings and comforts of the precious Gospel.

Opposition to these doctrines will be made, so long as there are people in the world who place some confidence in the flesh. Such are pleased with their own works, and are fond of taking merit to themselves. But the word of God is not of doubtful interpretation to those who rejoice in Christ Jesus. They are thankful for a free-grace salvation: and, while they enjoy the things which accompany it, with their lips and lives they desire to bless the God of all their mercies.

(1.) The common fallacy of calvinistic writers, in gratuitously styling the peculiarities of their System *The Doctrines of Grace;* whence obviously it is to be inferred, that the doctrines of Grace are rejected by those, who receive not the peculiarities of Calvinism: this common, though somewhat invidious, fallacy has not been escaped by Mr. Romaine.

By *The Doctrines of Grace*, however, Mr. Romaine means the doctrines inculcated by Mr. Coles in the volume which he recommends: and the doctrines, there inculcated, are, *Calvinistic Election* with its necessary (though rapidly slurred over) correlative *Calvinistic Preterition*, *Particular Redemption*, *Effectual Calling*, and *Certain because predestinated Final Perseverance in holiness.*

After this explanatory proëm which will prevent any misapprehension, we may safely consider the tendency of the strong laudatory phraseology employed by Mr. Romaine.

A Scheme of Doctrine, emphatically characterised, as being of such constant use to the children of God, that, without the stedfast belief of it, they cannot go on their way rejoicing; as being that alone System, from which settled peace can rule in the conscience, the love of God be maintained in the heart, and a conversation becoming the Gospel kept up in our walk and warfare; as approved to be agreeable to the Oracles of God; as firmly resting upon the divine word, which, to those who rejoice in Christ Jesus, is not of doubtful interpretation; and as found to be of such constant use, that, until a man receives it, he cannot enjoy the blessings and comforts of the precious Gospel: a Scheme of Doctrine, thus emphatically characterised, if *indeed* it be true, cannot but have been familiarly known to, and universally received by, the early Church of Christ, which was long personally taught either by the Apostles themselves or by the immediate disciples of the Apostles.

I readily admit, that, in the main, Mr. Coles treats his subject practically. We have a right, therefore, if the System exhibit the mind of Scripture, to expect the same distinct, though practical, treatment of it, on the part of the primitive ecclesiastical writers.

Now, on this point, I do *not* demand, that they should arrange their exhortations or insert their consolations, precisely under the same consecutive heads, and precisely with the same regard to order and method, that distinguish the Work of Mr. Coles: for, doubtless, the *form*, which he adopts, he owes to the exactness introduced by antecedent controversies. But I *do* conceive myself entitled to demand: that, with whatever irregularity of scholastic order, they

should unambiguously and delightedly dwell; upon the mighty privilege of an *Absolute Personal Election to eternal life;* upon the *Assured Indefectibility of Grace* in those, who have been thus absolutely elected; upon that distinguished favour of God, which first from all eternity absolutely elected, and which thence particularly and exclusively redeemed, those happy individuals who had been thus the subjects of his *Sovereign Predestination;* and upon the deep gratitude, which, for their own *Particular Redemption*, while the great mass of mankind was hopelessly pretermitted and excluded by an irrevocable decree of *Reprobation*, the Elect ought to feel toward God through Christ, and which they ought to evince by a life of holy devotedness and by a steadily consistent course of *Perseverance* in every good word and work: because we are assured by Mr. Romaine, both that these doctrines are approved to be agreeable to the Oracles of God, and that, without a stedfast belief and a constant use of them, a man can have no settled peace in his conscience, no love of God in his heart, no conversation becoming the Gospel, no enjoyment of scriptural blessings and comforts.

Nothing can be better, than the hallowed practical deductions of Mr. Coles himself from his own doctrinal principles. On the part, then, of the early ecclesiastical writers, I ask, in the way of evidence, no more, than similar practical deductions from the same avowed doctrinal principles, as from sacred truths denied in the Primitive Church by nobody.

Or let me take another illustration of my demand, perhaps still more appropriate.

No one can read the Commentary on the first Epistle of St. Peter by the excellent Archbishop Leighton, without perceiving, albeit there is not a grain of controversy through-

out the whole Work, that the pious and venerable author, though always theologising *practically*, yet, as a basis or as a doctrinal substratum, always theologises *calvinistically*.

So valuable is Christianity, under whatever more minute modification it may be made to present itself, that, through God's mercy and grace, I trust I have derived no small measure of edification from a repeated perusal of the Archbishop's Commentary.

Still, however, the question must be: *Whether the recorded practice of the early ecclesiastical writers, anterior to the time of Augustine, affords any evidence, that such was the precise doctrinal mode in which the Primitive Church was wont practically to theologise.*

(2.) Now we have *no* evidence, that the Primitive Church *did* practically theologise in the doctrinal mode, recommended by Augustine and Calvin, and adopted by Mr. Coles and Archbishop Leighton: on the contrary, we have plain evidence, that of *that* doctrinal mode the Primitive Church was altogether ignorant.

By far the most practical writers of the early Church, whose Works have come down to us, are the Roman Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, the Pseudo-Barnabas, and Cyprian. Yet never once do the four first base their exhortations upon the peculiarities of Calvinism: and, as for the last, whose productions are remarkably extensive and (to use a modern technical expression) peculiarly *experimental*, even Mr. Milner himself, notwithstanding Augustine would fain impress him into his service as a witness, fairly gives him up, as a person who *appears not to have understood the doctrine of the Election of Grace**.

* Milner's Hist. of the Church of Christ, cent. iii. chap. 15. § 2. vol. i. p. 520.

(3.) What, then, is the necessary result, according to that view of the vital importance and absolute indispensability of Calvinism, which has been taken by a zealous Calvinist himself?

If the estimate of Mr. Romaine be correct, the primitive Christians, though they had received their Theology from the Apostles, yet lacking the doctrine of *Election* as subsequently with its concomitants expounded by Augustine and Calvin, could *not* have gone on their way rejoicing, could have had *no* settled peace ruling in their conscience, could have had *no* love of God maintained in their heart, could have kept up in their walk and warfare *no* conversation as becometh the Gospel, could have enjoyed *none* of the precious Gospel's blessings and comforts.

Now can any sober person believe, that such universally was the lamentable condition of the Primitive Church?

Yet, according to the estimate of Mr. Romaine, such *must* inevitably have been its unhappy state until the beginning of the fifth century: for, so far as historical testimony is concerned, it is a clear case, that, until the time of Augustine himself, the Church knew nothing of *Augustinian Election;* and, accordingly, Augustine tells us, that, although he had duly received the usual catechumenical instructions, there *was* a period of his life when he had not as yet DISCOVERED that doctrine*.

To say, that *The doctrine of Calvinistic Election is contained in the Bible;* nay, as Mr. Romaine speaks, that *On that doctrine and its adjuncts the word of God is not of doubtful interpretation:* is to say nothing more, than that *A private individual pronounces such to be the alone proper in-*

* Nondum diligentius quæsiveram, nec *adhuc inveneram*, qualis sit Electio Gratiæ. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. i. c. 3. Oper. vol. vii. p. 486.

terpretation of the Bible. In other words, such an assertion is a mere resolute begging of the question.

Meanwhile, if this private dogmatical interpretation be received and retained as the truth, we shall find it impossible to avoid the consequence: that *The Primitive Church, although taught by the Apostles themselves, and although long conversant with the immediate disciples and successors of the Apostles, was, until the beginning of the fifth century, profoundly ignorant of any such interpretation.*

2. Yet, if the value of Calvinism to the truly pious believer be such as Mr. Romaine alleges, we cannot but marvel, that God, in his mercy, should never have revealed it to the early Church, or, on the supposition of his having actually revealed it, that the primitive Christians should not be at all aware of the existence of the revelation.

Surely, under these circumstances, when we are told, that, without an admission of the peculiarities of that System, no settled peace can rule in the conscience, no love of God be maintained in the heart, and no blessings and comforts of the Gospel can be enjoyed: we are naturally led to inquire, whether such a character can be strictly correct.

The principle, I suppose, upon which Mr. Romaine proceeded, is that, which I have not unfrequently heard advanced by good men whom I love and esteem.

Every real Christian, say they, *is a Calvinist in his heart, whatever he may be in his head.* And, for the adoption of this sort of real, though well nigh unperceived, Calvinism (the very Calvinism, according to Mr. Milner, involved by Justin, with happy inconsistency, in his experience, though in words never explicitly acknowledged), the reason assigned is: that *Except on the plan of an assured and irreversible Election to eternal glory, no person can feel any solid comfort or satisfaction in his own state; because no person can say,*

whether he attains to the requisite standard of holiness, or whether after all he may not finally fall away to perdition.

(1.) To the present development of what I conclude to have been Mr. Romaine's principle, it might be sufficiently replied: that *Such a statement as this can never, in the very nature of things, be made to bear upon the simple question of the* TRUTH *or* FALSEHOOD *of a doctrine.*

In other words, it might be sufficiently replied: that *No inward feeling of the* COMFORT *of being irreversibly elected to eternal happiness can, by any conceivable possibility, establish the actual* EXISTENCE *of such a plan of Election.*

(2.) But I would meet this not uncommon language, even on the very principle which it advances: a principle, the solidity of which could alone justify Mr. Romaine's exaggerated account of the spiritual value and benefit of the Calvinistic System.

Those pious individuals, who employ such language, unconsciously confound together two points, which in themselves are essentially different and distinct: namely, *The abstract alleged* TRUTH *of the calvinistic doctrine of Election;* and *The concrete assumed* CERTAINTY, *that he, who maintains the abstract truth of that doctrine, is himself one of the Elect.*

Now the statement before us tacitly reposes upon the position: that *These two points* COINCIDE. And, *thence*, that is to say *from such* COINCIDENCE, the peculiar spiritual comfort of the doctrine of *Calvinistic Election*, on the part of those who hold it, is confidently insisted upon.

But this is a mere fallacy.

On the supposition, that *The doctrine of Calvinistic Election is scripturally true*, it by no means follows, that *Every person, who receives it, is* THEREFORE *one of the Elect.*

Yet it is quite clear: that any comfort, accruing to the

individual, *must* arise, not from *His abstractedly holding the doctrine of Calvinistic Election to be a scriptural truth*, but from *His absolute certainty of his own particular election to eternal life.*

How, then, for the purpose of comfort, is this *Absolute Certainty* to be obtained?

Can it be said: that a mere belief in the *Abstract Truth* of the doctrine conveys an absolute certainty of the believer's *own* irreversible election to eternal glory?

This question will scarcely, I suppose, be answered in the affirmative.

Again, then, I ask: *How is a believer in the doctrine of Calvinistic Election to know assuredly, that he himself is one of the Elect?*

It must, I apprehend, be replied: that he can only know it, from the conformity of his heart and conduct with the requisitions of God's Holy Word.

But, if we be finally brought to *such* an answer, it is difficult to comprehend, what *greater* comfort can be held out by Calvinism than by Anticalvinism.

For a Calvinist may be just as much racked with doubt, whether, from his heart and life and conversation, he has sufficient evidence that he *himself* is one of the Elect: as an Anticalvinist may be racked with doubt, whether, from his heart and life and conversation, he has sufficient evidence, that he is *indeed* a genuine child of God.

In short, Calvinism can afford no peculiar comfort to any individual Calvinist, unless that individual Calvinist be assured that he is *himself* irreversibly elected to eternal salvation. And such an assurance must flow, not from a bare speculative belief of a particular Scheme of Theology, but from a conscious conformity of his heart and life and conversation with God's word: *the Spirit itself*, from such con-

formity, *bearing witness with his spirit that he is a child of God**.

If, *without* that conformity, a man deem himself one of the

* Rom. viii. 16. On this point, it may be useful to hear the sentiments even of a Calvinist himself.

We cannot have a certain knowledge of our Election to eternal life, before we do believe: it is a thing hidden in the unsearchable counsel of God, until it be manifest by our effectual calling and believing on Christ. —It is the ruin of many souls, that they trust in Christ for remission of sins, without any regard to holiness: whereas these two benefits are inseparably joined in Christ, so that none are freed from condemnation by Christ, but those that are enabled to walk holily, that is, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.—That faith, which receiveth not holiness as well as remission of sins from Christ, will never sanctify us: and, therefore, it will never bring us to heavenly glory. Marshall's Gospel-Mystery of Sanctification, direct. xi. p. 178, 183.

Here a pious Calvinist distinctly and sensibly confesses, that he can have no certain knowledge of his own personal election, save through the evidence of a faith which worketh by love and which thence produceth holiness.

I may add, that even *present* holiness can, to the individual *himself*, be no sure evidence of his election: because he *himself* cannot certainly know, that he will persevere *to the end*. Doubtless, on the Calvinistic Scheme, *God* knows, who are his Elect; and knows also, that, *as* such, they *will* finally persevere. But I perceive not, how any *individual* can certainly know, that *he* is one of God's Elect, save from the evidence of *final* perseverance as well as of *present* holiness. Hence I am at a loss to discern, how Calvinism can impart, to any individual Calvinist, that special comfort which it is said to impart.

The Divines of Dort pronounce, that the Elect, each in due time, become assured of their Election: but still they determine, that this assurance must spring from their producing the infallible fruits of Election, not from a curious prying into God's secret decrees. Thus again we are brought precisely to the same test, as that which is equally insisted upon by their opponents.

De hac æterna et immutabili sui ad salutem electione, electi suo tempore, variis licet gradibus et dispari mensura, certiores redduntur: non quidem arcana et profunditates Dei curiosè scrutando; sed fructus electionis infallibiles, in verbo Dei designatos, ut sunt vera in Christum

Elect merely because he has an internal *feeling* that this is the case: such an individual may well be a subject of our hearty intercessory *prayer;* but he has placed himself out of the pale of any *reasoning* founded upon Scripture.

fides, filialis Dei timor, dolor de peccatis secundum Deum, esuries et sitis justitiæ, in sese, cum spirituali gaudio et sancta voluptate, observando. Judic. Synod. Dord. cap. i. § 12. Syllog. Confess. p. 408.

BOOK II.

THE POSITIVE TESTIMONY OF HISTORY IN REGARD TO THE TRUE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND PREDESTINATION.

A Primitiva Ecclesia, ab Apostolis, a Christo, non discessimus. Juell. Apol. Eccles. Anglican. apud Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 295.

THE

PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.

(BOOK II.)

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORICAL OR EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF CONTROVERSY.

In the Primitive Church, no feature is more remarkable, than the jealous accuracy with which she guarded sound doctrine and noted the rise and progress of error. As soon as ever a departure from the truth occurred, it was instantly pointed out and exposed: and, in consequence of this jealous inspection, we have the early heresies described and classified with the utmost precision and exactness*.

To a certain extent, this supervision prevails in every age: and, indeed, it is well nigh impossible, that a marked departure from an universally received System of Doctrine should occur without exciting both observation and animadversion.

Now, when observation and animadversion are brought into active operation, the result is *Theological Controversy*.

Hence, as the occurrence of Theological Controversy, on any topic, affords sure and certain evidence, that at least *two* clashing Systems of Opinion must then have been in existence: so the non-occurrence of Theological Controversy, on any topic, equally affords sure and certain evidence, that only a *single* System of Opinion was then in

* See my Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, book i. chap. 6. in init.

existence; or, at least, that, during the period in question, provided the great outline of ORIGINAL IDEALITY was preserved, subordinate or plausible innovations might easily pass without attracting any special attention.

These remarks may, I think, be profitably employed, both in estimating the claims of either *Calvinism* or *Arminianism* or *Nationalism* to genuine apostolicity, and in contrastedly introducing that *Primitive Scheme of the doctrine of Election*, which (so far as I can find) never varied, in point of IDEALITY, down even to the time of Augustine, though, in point of CAUSATION, a variety, so plausible as not to excite controversy, crept in about the end of the second century under the patronage of the Alexandrian Clement.

I. I shall begin with employing the remarks before us, in estimating the claims of either *Calvinism* or *Arminianism* or *Nationalism* to genuine apostolicity.

1. On the alleged testimony of Ignatius and the Roman Clement, Mr. Milner, we have seen, contends: that *Election, as Election was subsequently explained by Augustine and Calvin, was the universally received doctrine of the Primitive Church from the very beginning.*

Yet, while, on their alleged testimony, he would lay down this important position, he is compelled, even as he *himself* states the matter, to acknowledge: that *Justin Martyr, who was converted to the Faith and who was instructed in the doctrines of Christianity only about thirty years later than the death of St. John, who is full upon all the leading peculiarities of the Gospel, who duly maintains the tenet of Divine Grace, who in fundamentals is unquestionably sound, and who in personal character was a sincere Christian, never once, throughout all his writings, explicitly owns the doctrine of Election as that doctrine was subsequently explained by Augustine and Calvin.*

Precisely the same observation applies to the Works, both of his contemporaries, and of those who were his immediate chronological successors.

Irenèus in Gaul is no less silent, than Justin in Asia. The Attic Athenagoras, and the Assyrian Tatian, are not a whit more communicative. Theophilus of Antioch is equally taciturn. And Clement at Alexandria, and Tertullian in Africa, evince no consciousness of the existence of any such doctrine, as that of *Augustinian Election.*

(1.) On the theory, then, that *The doctrine of Augustinian Election was universally received and maintained by the earliest Church*, how is this extraordinary fact to be accounted for?

Mr. Milner's solution of the difficulty runs to the following effect.

From the more simple and the more scriptural mode of speaking which was used by Ignatius and the Roman Clement, the language of the Church was gradually and silently changed: so that, at length, the primitive doctrine of the Election of Grace became completely obsolete.

Now is such a statement borne out by *competent evidence?* In the ecclesiastical writings later than the age of Clement and Ignatius, do we find any *marks* of a gradual departure from the asserted Austinism or Calvinism of the earliest Church Catholic? Can we *trace*, step by step, the slow and lingering extinction of a once universally admitted System?

With respect to these inquiries, if Calvinism *were* the primitive faith, and if there *did* occur any *gradual* departure from this supposed primitive faith: there certainly are no *recorded* indications of that departure.

We pass *instantaneously* and *at once*, from what Mr. Milner would have us deem the distinctness and precision

of Clement and Ignatius, to a total absence of any even bare allusion to the doctrine of *Augustinian Election.*

Neither is this remarkable silence at all *peculiar* to a single writer like Justin, whose omission of explicitly owning the doctrine in question Mr. Milner would ascribe to a remaining taint of long cherished Philosophy. Let us travel through the Christian World in what direction we please; let us visit Irenèus in Gaul or Athenagoras at Athens or Theophilus at Antioch or Tertullian in Africa or Clement at Alexandria: still we invariably find the *same* ominous taciturnity. There is no struggling attempt to explain away the alleged primeval dogma of *Augustinian Election*, no gradual softening down of its harsher peculiarities by sinking or eluding or denying the concomitant dogmata of *Reprobation* and *Particular Redemption*, no comfortless writhing under an evident dislike of a tenet which yet could not be decently denied to have been the apostolically inculcated doctrine of the earliest Church Catholic. All this is plainly essential to Mr. Milner's hypothesis of *graduality:* but nothing of the sort can be detected. The authors, whom I have mentioned as the contemporaries or immediate successors of Justin, afford not the slightest evidence, that any such System, as that which in one word is conveniently styled *Calvinism*, ever existed in the Primitive Church.

Nor is the negativeness of mere silence the only difficulty. Had the Calvinistic Scheme been indeed the genuine doctrine of the Gospel, as universally received, by the earliest Church, on the avowed and notorious and *then* altogether undeniable inculcation of the inspired Apostles: it never could have so strangely expired, in the course of the second century, without a vestige of controversy, without a shadow of animadversion. A striking departure from a *known* apostolical doctrine *must* immediately have excited notice.

Such a departure would, at the least, be esteemed a most dangerous and presumptuous *error:* and, when I consider the genius of the early Church, which in no wise resembled the contemptuous liberalism of modern indifference or infidelity, I much mistake, if it would not have appeared, conspicuously emblazoned, in a catalogue of ancient *heresies.*

But not a trace of controversy can we discover: not a vestige of animadversion can we detect. If *Calvinism* were the apostolically received doctrine of the first age: it suddenly, in the second age, expired, without an effort made in its defence, without an arm raised in its vindication, nay even without attracting the slightest notice.

Yet *this* we must admit, if we admit the hypothesis of Mr. Milner. In other words, we must admit: that *The Church, though universally calvinistic in the first century and at the beginning of the second century, so suddenly and so unanimously threw off a known and acknowledged apostolical doctrine, that all controversy was precluded by a miraculously perfect harmony of sentiment, and that all notice of the change was deemed nugatory and superfluous*.*

* As Mr. Milner's theory is, that *The true doctrine of Election gradually became extinct in the course of the second century:* my sole business, of course, has been to shew, that *The writers of that century, so far from indicating the occurrence of any controversy on the occasion, do not even allude, in the slightest degree, to the alleged circumstance of its extinction.*

Yet, though, from the nature of Mr. Milner's theory, I stood thus confined to writers of the second century; a remarkable allegation of that historian requires me to follow him to a writer of the third century.

Where a man is deficient in knowledge, says he, *yet, if his simplicity of christian taste be very great, he will be silent on those subjects which he does not understand, or at least he will be extremely cautious in opposing any part of divine truth. This was Cyprian's case. He appears not, for instance, to have understood the doctrine of the Election of Grace. Since Justin's days, the knowledge of that article of faith was departing*

Will such an admission accord with general and ordinary experience?

I think not. Let us, however, note some few examples.

from the Church. But he opposed it not. Origen, less humble and less submissive to divine instruction, and feeling more resources in his reasoning powers, dares to oppose it by a contrary statement. Hist. of the Church of Christ, cent. iii. chapter 15. § 2. Vol. i. p. 520, 521.

It is quite clear, that this allegation implies and supposes the existence of a party in the Church, which still held the doctrine of the *Election of Grace* in the sense wherein Mr. Milner contends both that it *ought* to be held and that it *was* held from the beginning. For Cyprian's alleged conscientious abstinence from all opposition to that doctrine, and Origen's alleged presumption in directly opposing it by a contrary statement, alike necessarily import, that that doctrine was still so prominently maintained in the middle of the third century, as either to excite a cautious reverence on the one hand, or to provoke a polemical animadversion on the other hand.

The statement, that *Cyprian opposed not the doctrine*, is perfectly true: but the evident implication of Mr. Milner, that *he was aware of its existence though he did not appear to have understood it*, is perfectly gratuitous. At least, it must be deemed perfectly gratuitous; unless he has succeeded in establishing the fact, of *the then existence of the doctrine*, from the evidence of Origen's alleged controversial opposition to it.

If Origen formally *opposed* the doctrine; there must have been persons in his time, who *held* the doctrine. Yet Augustine, as we have seen, when directly challenged to produce ancient authorities, never attempts to bring forward the persons in question: though, if any such persons, asserting their own Scheme of Doctrine to be the real System of the Primitive Church, had notoriously existed in the middle of the third century, and had notoriously been opposed by Origen in a Tract which has descended even to our own age; Augustine could scarcely have been ignorant, either of *their* existence, or of *Origen's* opposition.

Let us, however, in all fairness, examine the evidence, to which Mr. Milner refers, as establishing the fact, that *Origen opposed the calvinistic doctrine of the Election of Grace, or the doctrine of Election as understood by Augustine and Calvin, through the controversial adduction of a contrary statement.*

The Tract, appealed to by Mr. Milner, constitutes the twenty-first chapter of Origen's *Philocalia*. Here, therefore, we must seek for the testimony, which, through the medium of controversy, will demonstrate

The Protestant Belgic Churches were founded upon the very strictest principles of Calvinism. A difference of opinion, however, soon arose: and this difference shewed

the existence of a party, still, in the middle of the third century, holding the strictly primitive doctrine of *Calvinistic Election*.

Now I have carefully perused the entire Tract in question: and certainly, so far from its affording any warrant for Mr. Milner's allegation, it does not so much as even once mention the doctrine of *Election* in any sense of the word. It is a short treatise on *Free Will*: and, as its very description of those whom it opposes abundantly shews, it was directed against *the Fatalising System of the Gnostics and the Manichèans*.

Ἔργον ἡμέτερον τὸ βιῶσαι καλῶς ἐστι· καὶ αἰτεῖ ἡμᾶς τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς, ὡς οὐκ αὐτοῦ ὄν, οὐδὲ ἐξ ἑτέρου τινὸς παραγινόμενον, ἢ, ὡς οἴονται τινὲς, ἀπὸ εἱμαρμένης, ἀλλ' ἢ ὡς ἡμέτερον ἔργον. Orig. Philocal. c. 21. p. 52.

Ἐπιχρῶνται τούτοις τῶν ἑτεροδόξων τινὲς, σχεδὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἀναιροῦντες, διὰ τὸ φύσει εἰσάγειν ἀπολλύμενας, ἀνεπιδέκτους τοῦ σώζεσθαι, καὶ ἑτέρας σωζομένας, ἀδυνάτους ἐχούσας πρὸς τὸ ἀπολέσθαι· τὸν τε Φαραὼ φασι φύσεως ὄντα ἀπολλυμένης, διὰ τοῦτο σκληρυνέσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐλεοῦντος μὲν τοὺς πνευματικοὺς, σκληρύνοντος δὲ τοὺς χοϊκούς. Ibid. p. 54.

Πρῶτον τοίνυν σημειωτέον ἐστι τὸν τόπον πρὸς τοὺς ἑτεροδόξους, λεξιθηροῦντας μὲν τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης τοιαῦτα, ἔνθα ἐμφαίνεται, ὡς αὐτοὶ τολμῶντες λέγουσιν, ὠμότης τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἡ ἀμυντικὴ καὶ ἀνταποδοτικὴ τῶν χειρόνων προαίρεσις, ἢ ὁ, τί ποτὲ θέλουσι τὸ τοιοῦτον ὀνομάζειν, μόνον ἵνα λέγωσιν οὐκ ἀγαθότητα εἶναι ἐν τῷ κτίσαντι· οὐχ ὁμοίως δὲ οὐδὲ εὐγνωμόνως ἐντυγχάνοντας τῇ καινῇ, ἀλλὰ παραπεμπομένους τὰ παραπλήσια οἷς νομίζουσιν εἶναι ἐπιλήπτοις ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς. Ibid. p. 60.

These passages most abundantly shew the character of those, whom Origen was opposing. He wrote not against *Calvinists by anticipation*; for no such religionists were either then, or ever had been, in existence: but he wrote against the various sects of the *Gnostics* and *Manichèans*; whom Mr. Milner has singularly mistaken for a still existing party of advocates of that augustinian doctrine of *Election*, which he contends to have been the really apostolic System of the Primitive Church. Accordingly, Tarinus, the annotator upon the *Philocalia*, justly remarks, that Origen is castigating the followers of Basilides and Marcion.

As my present Work is purely concerned with FACTS, it is no part of

itself in the writings of those, who were then denominated *Remonstrants*, and who have since been generally styled *Arminians*. Controversy was the natural, and (as most

my business either to vindicate or to censure the *mode*, in which Origen maintains *the Freedom of the Human Will*, while he inculcates *the necessity of Divine Grace to make that Free Will a Good Will*. Suffice it to say, that, be it right or be it wrong, his view of the matter is precisely the same, as that which was adopted by Melancthon after he had renounced his early adhesion to what he subsequently called *the horrible falsehood of Manichèan Imagination*. He supposed, that the Grace of God is necessary to take away our heart of stone and thus to make our Free Will a Good Will: but then he also supposed, that this Divine Grace is offered to those who are willing to avail themselves of it, not forced upon those who refuse to accept it. This was the doctrine taught by Origen, when opposing the Fatalism of the Gnosticising Sects: and this same was the doctrine asserted by Melancthon, when he rejected what he himself describes as his early Manichèism.

Ὁ θεῖος λόγος ἐπαγγέλλεται τῶν προσιόντων τὴν κακίαν ἐξαιρεῖν, ἣν ὠνόμασε καρδίαν λιθίνην, οὐχὶ ἐκείνων μὴ βουλομένων, ἀλλ' ἑαυτούς τῷ ἰατρῷ τῶν καμνόντων παρεσχηκότων· ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις εὑρίσκονται οἱ κάμνοντες προσερχόμενοι τῷ Σωτῆρι, καὶ ἀξιοῦντες ἰάσεως τυχεῖν, καὶ θεραπευόμενοι· καὶ ἐστι, φέρ' εἰπεῖν, τὸ τοὺς τυφλοὺς ἀναβλέψαι ἔργον, κατὰ μὲν τὸ ἐξιωκέναι, τῶν πιστευόντων δυνάσθαι θεραπευέσθαι· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς ὁράσεως, τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. Οὕτως οὖν ἐπαγγέλλεται ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμποιήσειν ἐπιστήμην τοῖς προσιοῦσιν, ἐξελὼν τὴν λιθίνην καὶ σκληρὰν καρδίαν, ὅπερ ἐστι τὴν κακίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τινα πορεύεσθαι ταῖς θείαις ἐντολαῖς καὶ φυλάσσειν τὰ θεῖα προστάγματα. Ibid. p. 59. Vide etiam p. 62, 63.

Vidi multos non Epicureos, qui, cum essent in aliquo moerore propter suos lapsus, disputabant, *quomodo sperem me recipi, cum non sentiam in me transfundi novam lucem et novas virtutes? Præterea, si nihil agit liberum arbitrium, interea, donec sensero fieri illam regenerationem de qua dicitis, indulgebo diffidentiæ et aliis vitiosis affectibus.* Hæc Manichæa Imaginatio horribile mendacium est: et, ab hoc errore, mentes abducendæ sunt; et docendæ, agere aliquid liberum arbitrium. Melanc. Loci Theol. de libero arbitrio, p. 92, 93.

Sciendum est autem, Spiritum Sanctum efficacem esse per vocem Evangelii auditam seu cogitatam, ut Galat. iii. dicitur, *Ut promissionem*

persons will think) the inevitable, consequence. Then followed the authoritative Synod of Dort, which minutely defined and vindicated the Five Points, and which explicitly condemned the doctrines of the Remonstrants.

Spiritus accipiamus per fidem: ac sæpe dictum est, cogitantes de Deo oportere ordiri a verbo Dei, non quærere Deum sine suo verbo. Cumque ordimur a verbo, hic concurrunt tres causæ bonæ actionis: Verbum Dei; Spiritus Sanctus; et Humana Voluntas, assentiens nec repugnans Verbo Dei. Posset enim excutere, ut excutit Saul sua sponte. Sed, cum mens audiens ac sustentans non repugnat, non indulget diffidentiæ; sed, adjuvante etiam Spiritu Sancto, conatur assentiri: in hoc certamine, voluntas non est otiosa. Ibid. p. 91.

Si tantum expectanda esset illa infusio qualitatum sine ulla nostra actione, sicut Enthusiastæ et Manichæi finxerunt: nihil opus esset ministerio evangelico, nulla enim lucta in animis esset. Sed instituit Deus ministerium, ut vox accipiatur, ut promissionem mens cogitet et amplectatur, et, dum repugnamus diffidentiæ, Spiritus Sanctus simul in nobis sit efficax. Sic igitur illis, qui cessationem suam excusant, qui putant nihil agere liberum arbitrium, respondeo: Imo mandatum Dei æternum et immotum est, ut voci Evangelii obtemperes, ut Filium Dei audias, ut agnoscas Mediatorem. Quam tetra sunt hæc peccata, nolle aspicere donatum generi humano Mediatorem Filium Dei! *Non possum:* inquies. Imo, aliquo modo, potes: et, cum te voce Evangelii sustentas, adjuvari te a Deo petito; et scito velle Deum hoc ipso modo nos convertere, cum promissione excitati luctamur nobiscum, invocamus, et repugnamus diffidentiæ nostræ et aliis vitiosis affectibus. Ideo veteres aliqui sic dixerunt: Liberum arbitrium in homine facultatem esse applicandi se ad gratiam, id est, audit promissionem, et assentiri conatur, et abjicit peccata contra conscientiam. Talia non fiunt in diabolis. Discrimen, igitur, inter diabolos et genus humanum, consideretur. Fiunt autem hæc illustriora, considerata promissione. Cum promissio sit universalis, nec sint in Deo contrariæ voluntates, necesse est, in nobis esse aliquam discriminis causam, cur Saul abjiciatur, David recipiatur: id est, necesse est, aliquam esse actionem dissimilem in his duobus. Præterea, si de tota vita piorum loquamur, etsi est ingens imbecillitas, tamen aliqua est libertas voluntatis, cum quidem jam a Spiritu Sancto adjuvetur. Ibid. p. 93, 94.

Adversus Manichæos hæc fundamenta tenenda sunt:—omnes homines posse converti ad Deum; nec voluntatem se habere purè passivè, sed

The whole of this was just what we should expect: and the fact of the collision is proof positive, that *Calvinism had been held and taught by the reformed Belgic Churches.*

So again: during the reign of our first James, a most powerful body within the Church of England strenuously maintained the peculiarities of Geneva: and the extent, to which they carried their doctrinal system, is evinced by the official signatures, of the anglican deputies, to *all* the decisions of the Synod of Dort*. A material change of sentiment, as we well know, took place in the time and under the auspices of Archbishop Laud. And what was the result? Did English Calvinism expire in silence and without a struggle? Nothing of the sort. A controversy immediately commenced, which has continued down to the present day.

If, then, *Calvinism* were assuredly the doctrine of the earliest Church Catholic, and if the tide of opinion began to set against it in the age of Justin Martyr: how happened it, that no Synod was called, that no doctrinal canons were propounded, that no controversy arose, that no strenuous Bogerman or Carlton or Scultet or Breytinger or Alsted or Trigland sprang up to condemn and to confound the notorious innovators?

aliquo modo activè, ac assentiri posse Deo trahenti. Melanc. Expos. Symbol. Nic. Oper. vol. i. p. 415.

For these citations from Melancthon, I am indebted to Abp. Laurence's Bampton Lectures, p. 308, 315, 316, 317, 318: a Work, which contains, in small space, a larger quantity of valuable materials and original research, than almost any Work I ever met with.

* The deputies, who thus subscribed, were George Carlton, then Bishop of Llandaff, John Davenant, afterward Bishop of Salisbury, Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College, and Thomas Goad, Precentor of St. Paul's. Joseph Hall, afterward successively Bishop of Exeter and Bishop of Norwich, refused to subscribe the decisions of the Synod, and subsequently published his *Via Media.*

Had the Primitive Church been *careless* or *slow* in the censure and denunciation of heresies, we peradventure might not have marvelled at her supineness and silence. But, when we know her *zeal* and *promptitude*, and when we recollect that no heresy appeared without being *immediately* classed and controverted: we must needs deem it passing strange, that the Calvinistic Scheme, if indeed held universally by the earliest Christians on the full and invincible personal assurance that they had received it direct from the mouths of the Apostles, should have died in the second century, and in death should have made no sign.

(2.) The *silence* of the second century stands curiously and remarkably contrasted with the *disputativeness* of the fifth century: when the doctrine of *Calvinistic Election* was, as Mr. Milner would say, after a long sleep, *resuscitated;* or, as I should rather incline to say, and as Augustine himself incidentally and unwarily says, when it was first *discovered* by the diligent scriptural researches of that eminent Father.

No sooner did the Bishop of Hippo propound his System, than he was, as we have seen, immediately charged with innovation. Simply as a FACT, it was alleged against him; that *Neither the Church at large, nor the earlier Fathers who had preceded him, knew any thing of such a Scheme of Doctrine:* and it was insisted; that, *For the purpose of confuting Pelagianism, there was no need to call in the hitherto unheard of speculations of Election and Reprobation, as they were advanced by Augustine.*

This difference, as might naturally be expected, forthwith produced a controversy: and the controversy finally led to the convocation of a Synod or Council at Orange.

Now, as the very existence of such a controversy in the fifth century distinctly proves; that *Austinism* WAS NOT *the received doctrine of the Church, when propounded by Augus-*

tine: so the occurrence of a similar controversy in the second century, *had* any such controversy *then* occurred, would, *mutatis mutandis*, have similarly proved; that *Austinism* WAS *the received doctrine of the Church, as the Church subsisted in the age which touched and mingled with the age of the Apostles.*

But there is no evidence, that any such controversy existed in the second century: and, indeed, Mr. Milner himself tells us, that the language of the Church, in this respect, was changed *gradually* and *silently.*

Therefore, so far as I can judge, the very absence of such controversy is itself a proof: that *The earliest Church knew nothing of the doctrine of Election as understood and expounded by Augustine and Calvin.*

2. The observations, which have been made in regard to the absence of all controversy, anterior to the time of Augustine, on what may be briefly styled *The Calvinistic Question*, clearly apply, with equal force, to the two other Schemes of *Arminianism* and *Nationalism.*

There is no more evidence of the occurrence of any controversy on account of the rival claims of those two Systems, than there is of any controversy on account of the claims of the Calvinistic System.

Yet, if any one of the three Systems had been apostolically received from the beginning, the other two must inevitably be false: and, whenever the primitive Scheme began to be impugned to make way for either of the two others, a controversy would assuredly forthwith commence.

But no controversy whatever took place anterior to the time of Augustine: and, when a controversy *did* then spring up, neither *Arminianism* nor *Nationalism* was the System defended, as the ancient System, against nascent *Austinism* or *Calvinism;* which clearly *must* have been the case, had

either of those two Systems been the primitive System received from the beginning. On the contrary, the System, alleged against Augustine by the Massilian Christians, on the professed ground of easily traced antiquity, as the notoriously primeval System of the Catholic Church, was, in point of IDEALITY, totally different from either *Arminianism* or *Nationalism:* for it was a System, which respected and which was built upon the deep mystery; *Why the Gospel was offered to this individual, rather than to that individual; why it was offered at this time, rather than at that time; why it was preached in this country, rather than in that country; why this individual was elected into the pale of the Church, rather than that individual*.*

* Cum autem dicitur eis; *Quare aliis vel alicubi prædicetur, vel non prædicetur, vel nunc prædicetur quod aliquando pene omnibus sicut nunc aliquibus gentibus non prædicatum sit:* dicunt, *Id præscientiæ esse divinæ, ut, eo tempore, et ibi, et illis, veritas annunciaretur, vel annuncietur, quando et ubi prænoscebatur esse credenda.* Et hoc, non solum aliorum catholicorum testimoniis, sed etiam sanctitatis tuæ disputatione antiquiore, se probare testantur. Hilar. Arelat. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 483.

Jerome's opposition to the whimsical *private* Scheme of Origen, long after Origen's death, can scarcely, I think, be deemed controversy: it may serve, however, to shew, that innovations upon the ancient System were not suffered to pass unnoticed.

Alius vero (scil. Origenes), qui Deum justum conatur ostendere, quod, non ex præjudicio scientiæ suæ, sed ex merito electorum, unumquemque eligat.—Priusquam animæ præcipitarentur in mundum, et mundus ex animabus fieret, cum habitatricibus suis in infimum ipse dejectus, elegit Paulum Deus et ei similes coram se, qui erant sancti et immaculati.—In illa dejectione mundi, eos, qui, antequam mundus fieret, electi erant a Deo, missos esse in eruditionem et magisterium animarum peccatricium, ut, ad prædicationem eorum, reverterentur ad eum locum unde corruerant.—Ad quod bifariam est respondendum. Non enim ait Paulus: *Elegit nos ante constitutionem mundi, cum essemus sancti et immaculati:* sed *Elegit nos, ut essemus sancti et immaculati;* hoc est, qui sancti et immaculati ante non fuimus, ut postea essemus.—Nos, ante-

Such, when controversy at length sprang up from the inculcation of *Austinism*, was the System, in point of IDEALITY, which was maintained as the ancient System against a new System. The absence, therefore, of all controversy on behalf of either *Arminianism* or *Nationalism*, and the absence of all controversy on behalf of *Calvinism* until the time of Augustine when it was confidently alleged to be a mere unauthorised novelty, certainly demonstrate, that neither *Calvinism* nor *Nationalism* nor *Arminianism* could have been the System entertained, as apostolical, by the Primitive Church.

II. Precisely the same remarks, which have been thus employed in the case of the three several most popular modern Systems, will serve to introduce an inquiry into the nature of the aboriginal Scheme of Doctrine.

That the ancients *must* have entertained *some* opinion in regard to the import of the scriptural terms *Election* and *Predestination*, cannot be doubted: and that this opinion, whatever in point of IDEALITY and CAUSATION it might be, passed universally current, or at least with no change beyond what from its plausibility might well escape animadversion, down to the time of Augustine, is clear from the very absence of all controversy on the subject.

Hence, as we have now *negatively* settled, what was *not* the primitive opinion; the next question will be *positively*, what that primitive opinion really *was*.

If that opinion, to which the Christians of Marseilles not obscurely allude, can be definitively ascertained, a most important additional inquiry will immediately arise: namely,

quam essemus, prædestinati sumus, et tunc spiritum adoptionis accepimus, quando credidimus in Filium Dei. Hieron. Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes. i. Oper. vol. vi. p. 162. Vide etiam Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruffin. lib. i. c. 6. Oper. vol. ii. p. 199.

Whether the primitive opinion will naturally and easily accord with the language of Scripture both under the Law and under the Gospel.

Should the result of such an inquiry be, that *The ascertained opinion of the Primitive Church readily acts the part of a key to the language of Scripture;* we shall then, I apprehend, have attained as near to certainty, as the nature of moral demonstration will permit.

These matters being settled, yet another inquiry, not abstractedly necessary in itself, yet abundantly important to the members of the Anglican Church, will obviously spring up: namely, *Whether the doctrine of the reformed Church of England be the doctrine of the Primitive Church and of Holy Scripture.*

Finally, for the satisfaction of our own minds, or (if we may say so without presumption) to vindicate the ways of God to man, it may be useful, still with the Primitive Church for our guide and assistant, to inquire into the RATIONALE or PRINCIPLE of the doctrine of *Election*, as that doctrine was received from Scripture and from the Apostles by venerable Antiquity.

1. In the case of the *writer*, an inquiry of this sort must, of necessity, have been conducted by him in the silence of the closet, before he himself could have arrived at the result. But, in the case of the *reader*, the process may be advantageously inverted: for, to the *reader*, the inquiry will be rendered more clear, if the result be first distinctly laid before him.

Such an arrangement is strictly analogous to the plan adopted in mathematical research: where the theorem, or point to be demonstrated, is, so far as the *reader* is concerned, made to precede the demonstration. And its advantage is, that, from the first, the reader is brought

acquainted with the conclusion: whence, without distraction, he is the more at liberty to watch jealously, whether, in the course of evolving the evidence, the conclusion is legitimately drawn out.

The result, then, to which I have been conducted, is this.

As contradistinguished, both from the doctrine of *Calvinistic Election*, from the more plausible doctrine of *Arminian Election*, and from the present (I believe) somewhat popular doctrine of *National Election:* the primitive Christians, anterior to the time of Augustine, held, in point of IDEALITY, the doctrine of *An Election of certain individuals out of all nations into the pale of the visible Church; with the merciful purpose and intention, on God's part, that through faith and holiness they should attain to everlasting life; but* (*since the immediate notion of their Election respected only an admission into the Church, not an admission into heaven*) *with a possibility, through their own perverseness, of their not making their Calling and Election sure, and of thus failing to obtain the conditionally promised reward.*

This, in point of IDEALITY, was, so far as I can find, the unvaried doctrine of the Catholic Church, down to the time of Augustine: but, in point of CAUSATION, a very important variety may easily be traced.

Anterior to the time of Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about the latter end of the second century, the impelling CAUSE of Election was believed to be *The Absolute Will and Sovereign Pleasure of God.*

But, after the time of Clement, the impelling CAUSE of Election was commonly, though not quite universally, supposed to be *God's foreknowledge of man's future fitness.*

This change, in point of CAUSATION, so far as we can venture to pronounce upon existing evidence, was first introduced by Clement of Alexandria himself. Its design was, to re-

move any objections to the older Scheme, which might be started upon the score of God's justice: and its plausibility, united to some shew of accordance with Scripture, secured for it a rapid and easy reception*. Such being its character, it produced no controversy. At all events, the fact of the change itself is certain: and no controversy, so far as I know, is recorded.

Since the three other Schemes of Doctrine are severally

* Its attempted proof from Scripture lay in Rom. viii. 29: *Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate.*

Here, it was argued, God's foreknowledge *precedes* God's predestination. Therefore the one must be the CAUSE of the other.

The conclusion is plausible: but it is warranted, neither by sound logic, nor by the immediate context.

To make out the conclusion, it is gratuitously assumed in the premises, that *God's foreknowledge* here imports, not *God's general foreknowledge of the future existence of certain individuals*, but *God's specific foreknowledge of the future characters of those individuals operating in the way of* CAUSATION.

Now this purely gratuitous assumption is forthwith contradicted by the immediate context, provided only we cite the entire clause, instead of stopping short in the middle of it.

Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son.

When the clause is thus fully read, the groundlessness of the assumption immediately appears. A divinely foreseen conformity to the image of God's Son is plainly exhibited, not as the CAUSE, but as the CONSEQUENCE, of predestination.

More piously, however, than judiciously, anxious to remove those injurious reflections upon God's justice, which, even in the time of St. Paul (Rom. ix. 15–24.), were made upon the CAUSATION of the ancient original System: the Christians, at the end of the second century, too hastily and too readily acquiesced in the solution of the Alexandrian Clement, which seemed so easily to meet the injurious reflections and thus at once to free them from their difficulties.

Thus acted not St. Paul, when similarly pressed.

Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it: Why hast thou made me thus?

distinguished by the specific names of *Calvinism* and *Arminianism* and *Nationalism*, it will be convenient to give also the primitive Scheme a descriptive appellation.

Its basis, then, like the basis of *Calvinism* and *Arminianism*, being *Individuality;* and its respect, like the respect of *Nationalism*, being *The Visible Church:* I have not sufficient skill to frame a more appropriate title of the System, than that of *Ecclesiastical Individualism;* or of the doctrine, than that of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election.*

2. Before I enter upon my proposed inquiries, I may be permitted to offer a few remarks upon that Scheme of Doctrine, which, in point both of IDEALITY and of CAUSATION, is strictly the *most* ancient.

(1.) A System, thus characterised, will naturally have its own conventional phraseology: and, unless the true drift and bearing of the System be known, the phraseology will be very apt to be misunderstood.

Accordingly, its really *generic* language has often erroneously been deemed *particular.*

ALL, without any individual exceptions, who, agreeably to the good pleasure of the divine will, have been elected into the Church, are *generically* addressed as *Heirs of Glory.*

But such language does not import *particularly*, that EVERY *elected individual will infallibly obtain the inheritance.* On the contrary, the promises of God must be received, as they are *generally* or *generically* set forth in Holy Scripture.

The attainment of everlasting life through the medium of faith and holiness is the *object* or *purpose* or *intention* of Ecclesiastical Individual Election.

Therefore the eternal happiness of ALL *generically* is viewed as the last link in the chain of electing love: because

it is so in purpose and intention, though not always *individually* so in effect and reality.

(2.) While the Gospel was gradually subverting Paganism and eclipsing Judaism, *Individual Ecclesiastical Election* both might, and in the course of God's providence would, assume the *aspect* at least of *National Ecclesiastical Election:* because, when Christianity became the universally adopted religion of a country, what was *individual* might coincide with what was *national.* Still, however, in point of IDEALITY, the doctrine of the Primitive Church respected, not *nations* as such, but *individuals* as being the accidentally component parts of nations.

Thus, for instance, the early Christians supposed not the Greeks *collectively* to be an elected nation, as contradistinguished from other nations which were not elected: but they viewed, as the Elect *among* the Greeks, those individuals, who, obeying the gospel call, had become members of the Church of Christ whether seated at Corinth or at Ephesus or at Colossæ or at Philippi or at Thessalonica.

Hence they esteemed the Catholic Church at large to be the Church of the Election, as comprehending the whole body or people of the Elect gathered individually out of every nation upon the face of the earth*.

* I have thought it right to put the case of *Individual Election gradually becoming equivalent to National Election:* though it may be doubted, whether, in point of fact, any such case has *ever yet* occurred; whatever it *may do* under the influence of the yet future predicted millennian period. In strictness of speech, *Ecclesiastical Individualism* can never merge in *Ecclesiastical Nationalism*, until we shall behold a nation, *every* individual member of which has been so *universally* elected into the Catholic Church of Christ, that not a *single* person remains without its pale in the character either of an infidel or a heretic. For, since *An Election into the sound Catholic Church of Christ* constitutes the true and primitive IDEALITY of Scriptural Election: it is

(3.) By holding, as they originally held, *God's Absolute Sovereignty and Supreme Will* to be the impelling CAUSE of Individual Election into the Church; or, in other words, by making *Designed Holiness* the CONSEQUENCE, not the CAUSE, of that Election: the strictly primitive Christians, according both to the plain declarations and the whole analogy of Scripture, effectually struck at the root of all fancied human merit, and amply secured the vital doctrine of *the Necessity of Divine Grace in order first to personal holiness and ultimately to everlasting life.*

obvious, that neither an infidel nor a heretic can be consistently deemed to have been *thus* elected; or, at least, if, in the first instance, they *were* thus elected, they plainly must be viewed as having deliberately and advisedly *renounced* the privileges of their election. To say, that those, who professedly *belong not* to the Church, are yet *members* of the Church of the Election, is a palpable contradiction in terms.

This circumstance, by the way, in itself forms an argument to prove: that the *Ecclesiastical Nationalism*, advocated by Mr. Locke, CANNOT exhibit the true Idea of Special Election.

CHAPTER II.

THE IDEALITY OF ELECTION ACCORDING TO THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

Among the Fathers who chronologically preceded Augustine, notices of the doctrine of *Election* are not so copious as we might have wished. We find them, however, in sufficient abundance to determine the real sentiments of the Primitive Church in regard to, what I am now about to examine, the point of IDEALITY: and, what is of special importance to an inquiry like the present, we find them, not merely in those somewhat later writers who would be said by Mr. Milner to have departed from the original apostolic faith, but also, and *that* in comparative abundance, in those of the contemporaries and pupils of the Apostles themselves.

That the investigation may be conducted with all possible fairness, I shall begin with simply giving the precise words of the witnesses adduced: and, when that shall have been done, I may then be allowed to subjoin a few remarks of my own.

I. The writers, whom I shall summon as witnesses, are the following: Clement of Rome; Ignatius; Hermas; Polycarp's Church of Smyrna; Justin Martyr; Irenèus; Clement of Alexandria; Cyprian; Ambrose; and Jerome.

It will readily be perceived, that I subjoin the much later testimonies of Ambrose and Jerome, not as being of any intrinsic consequence to my main object, but purely to connect the chain of evidence with the times of Augustine. Would we learn the doctrine of the strictly Primitive Church,

we must resort to the succession of the *earliest* ecclesiastical writers.

1. With this view, let us first hear the invaluable testimony of the Roman Clement, who, as the friend and fellow-labourer of St. Paul, must, above all other extant writers, have the most fully understood the true import of his so often litigated phraseology.

(1.) *On account of the calamities and afflictions which have befallen us, beloved brethren, we have been somewhat slow, in taking into consideration the matters respecting which you have made inquiry from us, as also in noticing the wicked and unholy sedition, so foreign and alien to* THOSE WHO ARE THE ELECT OF GOD, *which some few rash and self-willed individuals have inflamed to such a pitch of folly, as to occasion your honourable and celebrated and worthily all-beloved name to be greatly blasphemed**.

(2.) *There was a contest to you, by night and by day, on behalf of* ALL THE BROTHERHOOD, *that, with mercy and a good conscience,* THE NUMBER OF GOD'S ELECT MIGHT BE SAVED†.

(3.) *To these men, the Apostles, who had lived according to the rules of a divine polity, there was gathered together a great multitude of* THE ELECT, *who, on account of envy, having*

* Διὰ γενομένας ἡμῖν συμφορὰς καὶ περιπτώσεις, ἀδελφοὶ, βράδειαν δυσοίζομεν ἐπιστροφὴν πεποιηκέναι, περὶ τῶν ἐπιζητουμένων παρ' ὑμῖν πραγμάτων, ἀγαπητοὶ, τῆς τε ἀλλοτρίας καὶ ξένης τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ μιαρᾶς καὶ ἀνοσίου στάσεως, ἣν ὀλίγα πρόσωπα, προπετῆ καὶ αὐθάδη ὑπάρχοντα, εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀπονοίας ἐξέκαυσαν, ὥστε τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ περιβόητον καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀξιαγάπητον ὄνομα ὑμῶν μεγάλως βλασφημηθῆναι. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 1.

† Ἀγὼν ἦν ὑμῖν, ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς, ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς ἀδελφότητος, εἰς τὸ σωζεσθαι μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συνειδήσεως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 2.

endured many sufferings and torments, became among us most illustrious examples.*

(4.) *Let* US, *therefore, approach unto the Lord in holiness of soul, lifting up to him holy and unpolluted hands, loving our clement and merciful Father, who hath made* US *unto himself* A PART OF THE ELECTION. *For thus it is written; When the Most High divided the nations; as he scattered the sons of Adam, he appointed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the angels. Then his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord: Israel, the lot of his inheritance. And, in another place, he says: Behold, the Lord taketh unto himself a nation from the midst of the nations, as a man taketh the first-fruits of his threshing floor; and, out of that nation, shall come the holy of holies†.*

(5.) *Wherefore, to the innocent and the just, let us join ourselves: for these are* THE ELECT OF GOD‡.

(6.) *In love,* ALL THE ELECT OF GOD ARE PERFECTED§.

* Τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν θείως πολιτευσαμένοις, συνηθροίσθη πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν, οἵτινες, πολλαῖς αἰκίαις καὶ βασάνοις διὰ ζῆλον παθόντες, ὑπόδειγμα κάλλιστον ἐγένοντο ἐν ἡμῖν. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 6.

† Προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ εὔσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ. Οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται· Ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς δὲ ἔσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδὰμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων· ἐγενήθη μερὶς Κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακὼβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. Καὶ, ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ, λέγει· Ἰδοὺ, Κύριος λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν, ὥσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἅλω· καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια ἁγίων. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 29.

‡ Κολληθῶμεν οὖν τοῖς ἀθώοις καὶ δικαίοις· εἰσὶν δὲ οὗτοι ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. §. 46.

§ Ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 49.

(7.) *Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord shall not impute sin: neither is there craft in his mouth. This blessing is upon those who have been* ELECTED *by God through Jesus Christ*.*

(8.) *The* ELECT *David saith: I will confess unto the Lord†.*

(9.) *May the all-seeing God, who* ELECTED THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND US THROUGH HIM TO BE A PECULIAR PEOPLE, *grant, to every soul that calleth upon his great and holy name, faith, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, temperance, holiness, and wisdom‡.*

2. Let us next hear the testimony of Ignatius the disciple of St. John, who suffered martyrdom in the year 107 or (as some think) in the year 116.

(1.) *Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, to the Church which is in Ephesus of Asia, deserving beatification, blessed in the greatness and fulness of God the Father,* ALWAYS PREDESTINATED BEFORE THE WORLDS TO GLORY, *that it should be permanent and unchangeable and united and* ELECTED *in true suffering, according to the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God, wisheth most abundant joy in Jesus Christ and in blameless grace§.*

* Μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν· οὐδὲ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος. Οὗτος ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλελεγμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. §. 50.

† Φησὶ γὰρ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς Δαβὶδ· Ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ Κυρίῳ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 52.

‡ Ὁ πανόπτης Θεὸς,—ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον, δώη, πάσῃ ψυχῇ ἐπικεκλημένῃ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, πίστιν, φόβον, εἰρήνην, ὑπομονὴν, μακροθυμίαν, ἐγκράτειαν, ἁγνείαν, καὶ σωφροσύνην. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 58.

§ Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, τῇ εὐλογημένῃ ἐν μεγέθει Θεοῦ Πατρὸς

(2.) *Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, to the holy Church which is in Tralles of Asia, beloved by God the Father of Jesus Christ,* ELECT *and worthy of God, having peace in the flesh and blood which is the passion of Jesus Christ our hope, in the resurrection which is unto him, writeth this epistle*.*

3. We may next attend to the language of Hermas: who, by Origen and Eusebius and Jerome, is identified with the Hermas mentioned by St. Paul; and who, from internal evidence afforded by his writings, is, by Hammond and Dodwell, pronounced to have at least flourished within forty years after the crucifixion.

(1.) *God, by his powerful virtue, has founded* HIS HOLY CHURCH *which he has blessed. Lo, he will remove the heavens and the mountains, the hills and the seas: and all things shall be made plain to* HIS ELECT; *that he may accomplish unto them the promise which he hath promised, when, with much honour and joy, they shall have observed the legal ordinances of God, which in great faith they have received†.*

(2.) *Thou canst tell these things to* THE ELECT OF GOD‡.

πληρώματι, τῇ προωρισμένῃ πρὸ αἰωνων διὰ παντὸς εἰς δόξαν, παράμονον, ἄτρεπτον, ἡνωμένην, καὶ ἐκλελεγμένην, ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ, ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀξιομακαρίστῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, πλεῖστα ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ καὶ ἐν ἀμώμῳ χάριτι χαίρειν. Ignat. Epist. ad. Ephes. § 1.

* Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, ἠγαπημένη Θεῷ Πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίᾳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Τράλλεσιν τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ ἀξιοθέῳ, εἰρηνευούσῃ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι τῷ πάθει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναστάσει. Ignat. Epist. ad Tralles. § 1.

† Deus,—virtute sua potenti, condidit sanctam ecclesiam suam, quam benedixit. Ecce, transferet coelos et montes, colles et maria: et omnia plana fient electis suis; ut reddat illis repromissionem quam repromisit, cum, multo honore et gaudio, servaverint legitima Dei, quæ acceperunt in magna fide. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 1. § 3.

‡ Potes hæc electis Dei renunciare. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 2. § 1.

(3.) *For, by his own glory, concerning* HIS ELECT, *that day being predetermined, the Sovereign Ruler hath sworn: Even now, if any one shall sin, he shall not have salvation**.

(4.) *Those squared and white stones, agreeing in their joints, are the apostles and bishops and doctors and ministers, who have ministered holily and modestly to* THE ELECT OF GOD, *both those who have now fallen asleep, and those who still survive*†.

(5.) *Beware, my sons, lest peradventure these your dissentions should defraud you of eternal life. How will you instruct* THE ELECT OF GOD, *when you yourselves have no discipline*‡ *?*

(6.) *Go, and relate to* THE ELECT OF GOD *his mighty deeds. —Woe to those doubtful ones who shall hear these words and despise them! It were better for them never to have been born*§.

(7.) *The white part represents the age about to come, in which shall dwell* THE ELECT OF GOD: *for* THE ELECT OF GOD *shall be pure and immaculate to eternal life. Cease not thou, therefore, to speak these things in the ears of* THE SAINTS‖.

* Juravit enim dominator ille, per gloriam suam, super electos suos, præfinita ista die: etiam nunc, si peccaverit aliquis, non habiturum illum salutem. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 2. § 2.

† Lapides quidem illi quadrati et albi, convenientes in commissuris suis, ii sunt apostoli et episcopi et doctores et ministri, qui—ministraverunt sanctè et modestè electis Dei, qui dormierunt, quique adhuc sunt. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 3. § 5.

‡ Videte, ergo, filii, ne forte hæ dissentiones vestræ fraudent vitam æternam. Quomodo vos erudire vultis electos Dei, cum ipsi non habeatis disciplinam? Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 3. § 9.

§ Vade ergo, et enarra electis Dei magnalia ipsius.—Væ dubiis illis, qui audierint verba hæc, et contempserint! Melius erat illis non nasci. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 4. § 2.

‖ Alba autem pars superventuri est sæculi, in quo habitabunt electi

4. Let us next observe the phraseology adopted by the Church of Smyrna in the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, who had been the disciple of St. John, and who had been appointed to the Episcopate of that city by the Apostles themselves.

When the executioner had stabbed him with his sword, such a vast torrent of blood rushed forth as to extinguish the very fire: and the whole multitude marvelled, that there should be such a difference between THE UNBELIEVERS *and* THE ELECT. *One of whom was this most admirable apostolic and prophetic teacher, having been the Bishop of the Catholic Church which is in Smyrna*.*

5. Next let us proceed to note the language of Justin Martyr, who was converted to the Christian Faith about the year 130 or only about thirty years after the death of St. John.

(1.) WE CHRISTIANS *are no mere contemptible mob:—but God* HATH ALSO ELECTED US; *and hath manifested himself to those, who inquired not after him.*—THROUGH THE LIKE CALLING THAT HE CALLED ABRAHAM, *charging him to go out from the land in which he dwelt;* THROUGH THAT VOICE HE HATH CALLED ALL OF US: *and we have now come out from the polity in which we lived, living wickedly according to the common practices of the other inhabitants of the earth†.*

Dei: quoniam immaculati et puri erunt electi Dei in vitam æternam. Tu ergo ne desinas loqui hæc auribus sanctorum. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 4. § 3.

* Καὶ, τοῦτο ποιήσαντος, ἐξῆλθε πλῆθος αἵματος, ὥστε κατασβέσαι τὸ πῦρ· καὶ θαυμάσαι πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, εἰ τοσαύτη τις διαφορὰ μεταξύ τῶν τε ἀπίστων καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν· ὧν εἷς καὶ οὗτος γέγονεν ὁ θαυμασιώτατος, ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις, διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς, γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Epist. Eccles. Smyrn. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. c. 15. p. 108.

* Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος δῆμος ἐσμὲν—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο

(2.) *Inasmuch as* GOD TOOK OUT OF ALL NATIONS THE NATION OF THE JEWS, *a nation useless and disobedient and faithless: he hath shewn, that* THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN ELECTED OUT OF EVERY NATION *are, through Christ, obedient to his counsel*.*

6. From Justin Martyr, we may pass to his contemporary Irenèus: who successively dwelt in the East and in the West; and who was the scholar of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John.

(1.) *The passage;* God stood in the congregation of the gods, between the gods he is a discerner: *is spoken concerning the Father and the Son and those who have obtained the adoption. But* THESE ARE THE CHURCH. *For* THE CHURCH IS THE CONGREGATION OF GOD, WHICH GOD, THAT IS THE SON, HATH HIMSELF COLLECTED THROUGH HIMSELF.—*Who, then, are those gods, to whom he declares:* I have said; Ye are gods, and ye are all the sons of the Most High? *Those, no doubt, who have obtained the grace of adoption, through which we cry; Abba, Father*†.

(2.) *The matters, which respect Isaac, are not devoid of*

ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν.—Διὰ τῆς ὁμοίας κλήσεως φωνῇ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν (Ἀβραὰμ), εἰπὼν ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐν ᾗ ὤκει· καὶ ἡμᾶς δὲ ἅπαντας, δι' ἐκείνας τῆς φωνῆς ἐκάλεσε· καὶ ἐξήλθομεν ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἐν ᾗ ἐζῶμεν, κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς γῆς οἰκητόρων κακῶς ζῶντες. Just. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 272.

* Ἐκ πάντων δὲ τῶν γενῶν, γένος ἑαυτῷ λαβὼν τὸ ὑμέτερον, γένος ἄχρηστον καὶ ἀπειθὲς καὶ ἄπιστον, δείξας τοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς γένους αἱρουμένους πεπεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τῇ βουλῇ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 282.

† Et iterum, *Deus stetit in synagoga deorum, in medio autem deos discernit*, de Patre et Filio et de his qui adoptionem perceperunt, dicit. Hi autem sunt Ecclesia: hæc enim est synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est Filius, ipse per semetipsum collegit.—Quorum autem deorum, quibus dicit: *Ego dixi; Dii estis, et filii Altissimi omnes?* Hi, scilicet, qui adoptionis gratiam adepti sunt, per quam clamamus: *Abba, Pater.* Iren. adv. hær. lib. iii. c. 6. p. 175.

significance. For, in the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle says: Rebecca also, having conceived from one, even our father Isaac, received an answer from the Word, that the purpose of God should remain ACCORDING TO ELECTION; not from works, but from him that calleth. It was said unto her: Two peoples are in thy womb; and two nations are in thy belly: and one people shall subdue the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger. *From which it is manifest: that not only the prophecies of the patriarchs, but also the parturition of Rebecca, foretold two peoples: one of which should be the elder, and the other the younger; and one of which should be in servitude, and the other free, though still of one and the same father. And one and the same God is both our God and their God: who takes cognizance of hidden things; who knows all things before they are; and who therefore says,* Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.—*The younger people received Christ the first-born, when the older people rejected him, saying,* We have no king, but Cæsar. *But, in Christ, there is universal blessedness: and, on this account, the later people tacitly snatched away from the Father the blessings of the former people, as Jacob stole away the blessing of Esau. For this reason, his own brother endured the snares and persecutions of his brother, as the Church hath endured this same treatment from the Jews.—The wages of Jacob were variegated sheep: and the wages of Christ are* MEN COLLECTED OUT OF VARIOUS AND DIFFERENT NATIONS INTO ONE COHORT OF THE FAITH*.

* Et ea autem, quæ circa Isaac, non sine significatione sunt. In ea enim Epistola, quæ est ad Romanos, ait Apostolus: *Sed et Rebecca, ex uno concubitu habens Isaac patris nostri, a Verbo responsum accepit, ut secundum electionem propositum Dei permaneat; non ex operibus, sed ex vocante. Dictum est ei: Duo enim populi, in utero tuo; et duæ gentes, in ventre tuo: et populus populum superabit; et major serviet minori.* Ex quibus manifestum est, non solum prophetationes patriarcharum, sed

(3.) *By the tower of* ELECTION *every where exalted and beautiful, the Lord God delivered, to other husbandmen paying fruits in their season, the figurative* VINEYARD, *now no longer hedged round, but expanded to the whole world. For, every where,* THE CHURCH *is illustrious: and, every where, is the wine-press dug round: because* THOSE, WHO RECEIVE THE SPIRIT, ARE ETERY WHERE. *The former husbandmen reprobated the Son of God: and, when they had killed him, they cast him out of the vineyard. Therefore God also has justly reprobated them: and has given,* TO NATIONS WHICH WERE WITHOUT THE VINEYARD, *the fructification of the culture*.*

(4.) *The universal going forth of the people from Egypt was, of God, appointed to be a type and image of* THE FUTURE GOING FORTH OF THE CHURCH FROM THE NATIONS†.

et partum Rebeccæ, prophetiam fuisse duorum populorum: et unum quidem esse majorem, alterum vero minorem; et alterum quidem sub servitio, alterum autem liberum; unius autem et ejusdem patris. Unus et idem Deus noster et illorum; qui est absconsorum cognitor; qui scit omnia, antequam fiant; et propter hoc dicens, *Jacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui.*—Junior populus eum primogenitum Christum accepit: cum eum repulit populus ætate provectior, dicens, *Non habemus regem, nisi Cæsarem.* In Christo autem universa benedictio: et, propter hoc, benedictiones prioris populi a Patre subripuit posterior populus; quemadmodum Jacob abstulit benedictionem hujus Esau. Ob quam causam, fratris patiebatur insidias et persecutiones frater suus, sicut et Ecclesia hoc idem a Judæis patiebatur.—Variæ oves, quæ fiebant hinc Jacob merces: et Christi merces, ex variis et differentibus gentibus, in unam cohortem fidei convenientes fiunt homines. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 38. p. 272.

* Quapropter et tradidit eam Dominus Deus, non jam circumvallatam, sed expansam in universum mundum, aliis colonis reddentibus fructus temporibus suis, turre electionis exaltata ubique et speciosa. Ubique enim præclara est Ecclesia; et ubique circumfossum torcular: ubique enim sunt, qui suscipiunt Spiritum. Quoniam enim Filium Dei reprobaverunt, et ejecerunt eum, cum eum occidissent, extra vineam: justè reprobavit eos Deus; et, extra vineam existentibus gentibus, dedit fructificationem culturæ. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 70. p. 302.

† Universa enim quæ ex Ægypto profectio fiebat populi, a Deo, typus

7. We may next exhibit the sentiments of Clement of Alexandria, who lived about the end of the second century.

(1.) *I define* THE CHURCH *to be, not the mere place of assembling, but* THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE ELECT*.

(2.) *We say: that There is only* ONE ANCIENT AND CATHOLIC CHURCH, *which, into the unity of one Faith that is according to its proper covenants or rather according to its single covenant evolved in different times, collects together, by the will of one God through one Lord,* THOSE ALREADY ORDAINED, WHOM GOD HAS PREDESTINATED†.

8. Let us next attend to the language of Cyprian, who flourished about the middle of the third century.

(1.) *The Holy Ghost, speaking in the person of the Lord, points out* THE ONE CHURCH, *when he says: One is my dove, my perfect one; one she is to her mother;* ELECT *she is to her parent*‡.

(2.) *If, forsaking* THE CHURCH *when he has been a confessor, and thus rending asunder the concord of unity, any person shall have exchanged his first faith for later perfidy; he cannot, merely by reason of his confession, flatter himself,* AS IF HE WAS ELECTED TO THE REWARD OF GLORY: *since, from*

et imago fiebat profectionis Ecclesiæ quæ erat futura ex gentibus. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 50. p. 286.

* Οὐ γὰρ νῦν τὸν τόπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. Oper. p. 715.

† Μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφόροις τοῖς χρόνοις, ἑνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βουλήματι δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib, vii. Oper. p. 765.

‡ Quam unam Ecclesiam, etiam in Cantico canticorum, Spiritus Sanctus, ex persona Domini, designat et dicit: *Una est columba mea, perfecta mea; una est matri suæ; electa genetrici suæ.* Cyprian. de unit. eccles. Oper. vol. i. p. 103.

this very conduct, the deservedness of his punishment is only increased. For the Lord ELECTED *Judas also among the Apostles: and yet Judas afterward betrayed the Lord**.

9. We may now, connecting the chain of earlier testimony with later testimony, hear Ambrose, who lived during the latter part of the fourth century, and who (it will be recollected) has been, with Calvin's full approbation, adduced by Augustine, as an authority for his own peculiar Scheme of interpretation more ancient than himself.

(1.) *When the Lord says to his disciples, that is, to the apostles;* If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me: *he speaks to Levites. Nevertheless, the passage;* YE ARE AN ELECT RACE, a royal Priesthood, a holy Nation, an adopted People: *is addressed to* ALL†.

(2.) *Sarah says mystically:* The Lord hath shut me up, that I should not bear; go in, therefore, unto mine handmaid, and beget a son for her; *in order that we may acknowledge, that* THE CHURCH OF GOD ALWAYS EXISTED IN PREDESTINATION, *and that the fecundity of Faith was prepared whensoever the Lord should command it to break forth; but yet, that, by the will of the Lord, it was reserved for a certain time*‡.

* Si Ecclesiam denique, ubi confessor factus est, derelinquens, et unitatis concordiam scindens, fidem primam perfidia posteriore mutaverit, blandiri sibi per confessionem non potest, quasi sit electus ad gloriæ præmium; quando ex hoc ipso magis creverint merita poenarum: nam et Judam inter apostolos Dominus elegit; et tamen Dominum Judas postmodum tradidit. Cyprian. de unit. eccles. Oper. vol. i. p. 118.

† Dominus Levitis dicit, cum, discipulis suis, hoc est, apostolis dicit: *Si quis vult post me venire, abneget semetipsum, et tollat crucem suam, et sequatur me.* Quanquam ad omnes jam dictum sit: *Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus in adoptionem.* Ambros. de fug. sæcul. c. 2. Oper. p. 198.

‡ Mysticè ait Sara: *Conclusit me Dominus, ut non pariam; intra*

(3.) *There are none, who are repudiated by Christ. But there are some, who are* ELECTED *by the Lord: since the Lord calleth the things which are not, as though they were. And* THE NATIONS OF THE GENTILES ARE ELECTED, *that the perfidy of the Jews might be destroyed*.*

10. Finally, let us attend to Jerome, the contemporary of Augustine, who flourished during the latter part of the fourth and the earlier part of the fifth century.

(1.) *The sacred history relates: that, as a type of* THE SYNAGOGUE *and* THE CHURCH, *many elder brothers were* REPROBATED *by the Lord, and many younger brothers were* ELECTED. *Thus Cain, the elder, is rejected; while Abel, the younger, is chosen: thus Ismael, the elder son of Abraham, is an alien from his father; while Isaac, the younger, receives the inheritance. Of the sons of Isaac, likewise, Esau, the elder, is a hunter, and wanders in the forests: while Jacob, the younger, dwells simply at home. Hence it is written in Malachi:* Jacob have I loved; but Esau have I hated. *And truly, according to the Apostle, while yet in their mother's womb, they had done neither good nor evil, nor had they either merit or offence, so that the one should be* ELECTED *and the other* REJECTED: *except, as we have said, in a type of* THE SYNAGOGUE *and* THE CHURCH, *the elder shall be cast aside, and the younger shall be taken*†.

ergo ad ancillam meam, et filium facies ex illa: ut agnoscas in prædestinatione fuisse semper Ecclesiam Dei, et paratam fidei fœcunditatem, quando juberet Dominus prorumpere; sed, voluntate Domini, certo reservatam tempori. Ambros. de Abraham. patriarch. lib. ii. c. 10. Oper. p. 1027.

* Non sunt, qui repudiantur a Christo. Sunt autem, qui eliguntur a Domino: quoniam Dominus vocat quæ non sunt, tanquam quæ sunt. Et electæ sunt gentium nationes, ut destrueretur perfidia Judæorum. Ambros. Enarr. in Psalm. xliii. Oper. p. 1380.

† Sacra narrat historia, seniores plurimos fuisse a Domino reprobatos,

(2.) *A person, who is* ELECTED, *may both be tempted and perish. Thus Saul was elected to be a king; and Judas, to be an apostle: yet, by their own fault, they afterward fell away*.*

II. I have now collected together such early evidence as I have been able to find, in regard to the sentiments entertained by the Primitive Church touching the doctrine of *Election and Reprobation.* This necessary task, therefore, having been performed, I may be allowed to offer a few remarks on the testimonies which have been produced.

1. On a careful perusal of the cited passages, it is impos-

et juniores electos, in typum Synagogæ et Ecclesiæ. Senior Cain abjicitur; et Abel junior eligitur: Ismael, filius Abraham, alienus a patre est; et Isaac junior hæreditatem accepit. Filiorum quoque Isaac, senior Esau venator est, et vagatur in saltibus: junior Jacob simpliciter habitat domi. Unde scriptum est et in Malachia: *Jacob dilexi; Esau autem odio habui.* Et rectè, juxta apostolum, nihil, in matris utero constituti, boni vel mali fecerant; nec habebant meritum aut offensam, ut eligeretur alter, et alter abjiceretur: nisi in typo, ut diximus, Synagogæ et Ecclesiæ, senior repelletur, et assumitur junior. Hieron. Comment. in Ezech. xxvii. Oper. vol. iv. p. 412.

Exactly to the same purpose speaks the Pseudo-Ambrose.

Jacob et Esau duorum populorum habent typum; id est credentium et non credentium: ut, cum ex uno sint, diversi sint tamen.—

Nam, cum nati nondum fuissent, aut aliquid egissent bonum vel malum, ut secundum electionem, propositum Dei maneret, non ex operibus, sed ex vocante, dictum est; Quia major serviet minori: sicut scriptum est; Jacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui.—

Hoc pertinet ad causam Judæorum, qui sibi prærogativa defendunt, quod filii sunt Abrahæ.

Sed, subintrantibus gentibus quæ sine Deo prius erant, et salutem quam illi perdiderunt accipientibus, exsuscitatur dolor: sed iterum, quia ipsi sibi perditionis causa sunt, sopitur. Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. ix. in Ambros. Oper. p. 1850.

* Nec statim, qui eligitur, tentari non potest nec perire: quia et Saul electus in regem, et Judas in apostolum, suo postea vitio corruerunt. Hieron. Comment. in Ezech. xx. Oper. vol. iv. p. 389.

sible not to perceive, that the same ruling IDEA runs, with strict harmony, through the whole of them.

In the phraseology of these passages, THE CHURCH and THE ELECT are perfectly coincident and commensurate*.

* Mr. Coles himself admits: that *The Church of Christ consists of Elect Persons;* or, in other words, that *The Church corporately is the Election.*

Such an admission, we might think, would be a virtual dereliction of the calvinistic idea, which confines the Elect to a certain number of special individuals *within* the Church Catholic, while other individuals equally *within* the Church Catholic are *not* to be deemed the Elect. But the necessity of that dereliction is avoided by the adoption of the theory: that *The Church of the Elect is not the* VISIBLE *Church Catholic, but an* INVISIBLE *Church within the visible Church Catholic, the members of which are known, with an absolutely infallible certainty, to God alone.* See Coles's Disc. on God's Sovereign. p. 103–168.

A theory of this description, it is quite clear, was never thought of by the primitive Christians: because it is totally inconsistent with their avowed opinions on the subject. By *The Church of the Elect*, they understood, not *An invisible and mystical Church every member of which was irreversibly elected and predestinated to eternal life*, but *The visible Church Catholic, which comprehended a mixture both of good and of bad, and of which the elect members might fall away to eternal perdition.*

As little can such a theory, I think, be reconciled with the plain and natural language of Scripture.

When St. Paul, speaking plurally of himself and of the whole body of Ephesian Christians whom he is addressing, says, that *God hath chosen us and predestinated us;* or when, addressing the whole body of the Colossian Christians, the same Apostle says, *Put on, as the Elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies;* or when St. Peter, addressing the whole body of the Christian Strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, speaks of them collectively, as being *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father:* it is difficult, from such language, fairly and reasonably to suppose, that not *The members of the entire visible Churches in Ephesus and Colossæ and Pontus and Galatia and Cappadocia and Asia and Bithynia* are meant by *The Elect*, but only *Certain individuals of those Churches, who must be viewed, quite apart from their ostensible brethren, as jointly constituting an invisible Church concealed within these visible Churches.*

God's Church and *God's Elect* are so plainly in Scripture spoken of

All, who have been gathered into the Church out of the mass of the unbelieving world, are considered and addressed as *The Elect of God:* while *The Church* herself, viewed collectively as *The Election*, is spoken of as *A Society or a People called and chosen out of the nations which had long remained ignorant of all true religion.*

Hence *The Elect of God* are not, as on the calvinistic and arminian plans which in point of IDEALITY are identical, contradistinguished from numerous persons *within* as well as *without* the pale of the visible Church: but those, from whom they are contradistinguished, are *Absolute unbelievers, who either have never heard the sound of the Gospel, or who have heard it only to reject the Gospel.*

Such a contradistinction springs inevitably from the Doctrinal System of the primitive Christians. The IDEALITY of the word *Election*, with a Calvinist and an Arminian, is *An Election of certain individuals to eternal life:* for, widely as

as coincident and identical, that the theory of *An invisible Church of the Elect* is absolutely necessary to the Calvinistic System. But, if, merely to serve a theological turn, we be at liberty, and *that* too in defiance of the testimony of the primitive Christians, *thus* to interpret Scripture: we may make the apostolical language speak any thing which best suits our preconceived purposes.

The Epistles are clearly written to certain whole *visible* and *tangible* Churches, accurately defined and specified according to their geographical localities.

Now ALL the members of those visible and tangible Churches, without any exception in favour of PARTICULARS, are collectively and generically spoken of as *The Elect.*

Doubtless, therefore, the term must have been used by the writers in a sense applicable to whole visible Communities.

Consequently, since we cannot believe that *every* member of *every* visible primitive Church was elect in the calvinistic sense of the word: the only sense, in which it can be applicable to whole visible Communities, is that of *An Election into the pale of the visible Church Catholic.*

they differ in their views of the principle of CAUSATION, they equally make *Eternal Life* the immediate and direct object or purpose or business of Election. But, with the primitive Christians anterior to the time of Augustine, the IDEALITY of the word *Election* was *An Election of certain individuals from all nations into the Church, with the object and intention indeed of their attaining to eternal life through the powerful instrumentality of those means of grace which constituted their high ecclesiastical privileges, but still, through sin and perverseness, with a possibility of their not attaining to it:* for, with the primitive Christians, the *immediate* purpose or business of Election was not *Eternal Life* itself, but *An Entrance into the visible Church in order to a thus mediate attainment of Eternal Life.*

Accordingly, when a primitive writer speaks of *The Elect*, his mind being preoccupied with his own familiar IDEALITY of the word *Election*, he constantly uses the terms *We* and *Us;* plainly employing those terms, as equivalent to *We professed Christians* or *Us professed Christians:* and, in like manner, when a message is to be delivered to *The Elect* as such, the messenger has no difficulty in determining or ascertaining what precise individuals *are* the Elect; on the contrary, he evidently considers himself, as sent to *All who are professed and admitted members of the visible Church Catholic.*

2. In strict agreement with this well-defined and well-understood IDEALITY, we find our early writers ever considering *The Election of the house of Israel collectively to be God's peculiar people*, as a type and shadow and homogeneous exemplar of *The Election of the Christian Church collectively to be an elect race and a holy nation and a peculiar people specially adopted of God in contradistinction to the great mass of unbelievers who have not been thus adopted.*

But the Election of Israel was the election of a certain family, containing certain individuals, out of the great mass of the unbelieving and idolatrous world, not to an irreversible certainty of eternal happiness hereafter, but into a Society which henceforth should *collectively* and (as it were) *officially* be God's *peculium*, however its numbers might hereafter gradually increase, and however some of its *individual* members might fail spiritually to profit by their advantages.

Therefore the antitypical and homogeneous Election of the Christian Church must, as we actually find to be the case, have been analogously viewed by the early divines, as an election of various families and individuals, out of the great mass of reprobated Unbelievers, not to an irreversible certainty of eternal salvation hereafter, but into a Society, which, occupying the place of the ancient apostate Levitical Church, should henceforth, with increasing numbers, constitute the *officially* peculiar people of God, whatever might be the precise character of certain *individuals* comprehended within it.

3. Such a view of the matter produced, of necessity, the opinion: that, Although all the Elect are chosen into the Church, *in order to* their final salvation through the medium of personal faith and holiness; yet God's ultimate *purpose* and *design* of Election, inasmuch as he employs only moral suasion and not physically irresistible coercion, is itself conditional, and may through man's perverseness be frustrated.

This being the case, though ALL within the pale of the visible Church were deemed the Elect of God; because, out of the great mass of the unbelieving world, they had been chosen into the Church to holiness, in order to their final attainment of everlasting felicity: yet, as from instances perpetually occurring we perceive to be the fact,

they judged, agreeably to the frequently vituperative language of St. Paul to the Corinthians notwithstanding they are collectively described as called to be *Saints* or *Elect;* that, within the pale of the Elected Church of Christ, there might be, and actually were, both good and evil.

Go, says the personified Church to Hermas, *and relate to* THE ELECT OF GOD *his mighty deeds. And thou shalt say unto them: This beast is the figure of the trial that is about to come. If, therefore, ye shall have prepared yourselves, ye may escape it, provided your heart be pure and without spot. —But woe to those doubtful ones, who shall hear these words and despise them! It were better for them never to have been born**.

4. The general consequence, therefore, of the primitive IDEALITY of Election, was obviously, as indeed it was declaredly, the following.

Election into the pale of the visible Church, though God's moral purpose and design is the attainment of everlasting happiness, does not irreversibly and infallibly assure eternal salvation to a person thus elected: or, in other words, *The Elect may finally perish, so far as individual members of the Church of the Election are concerned.*

The Sovereign Ruler hath sworn, by his own glory, concerning HIS ELECT: *Even now, if any one shall sin, he shall not have salvation*†.

Beware, my sons, lest peradventure these your dissentions should defraud you of eternal life. How will you instruct THE ELECT OF GOD, *when you yourselves have no discipline*‡?

If, forsaking the Church when a man has been a confessor,

* Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 4. § 2.

† Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 2. § 2.

‡ Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 3. § 9.

any person shall have exchanged his first faith for later perfidy, he cannot, merely by reason of his confession, flatter himself, as if he was ELECT *to the reward of glory: since, from this very conduct, the deservedness of his punishment is only increased. For the Lord* ELECTED *Judas also among the Apostles: and yet Judas afterward betrayed the Lord.**

A person, who is ELECTED, *may both be tempted and perish*†.

* Cyprian. de unit. eccles. Oper. vol. i. p. 118.

† Hieron. Comment. in Ezech. xx. Oper. vol. iv. p. 389.

CHAPTER III.

THE CAUSATION OF ELECTION ACCORDING TO THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

As, in point of IDEALITY, the doctrine of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election* was, from the beginning, held by the early Christians: so, in point of FACT, that doctrine could not but be even palpably felt to set forth an indisputable truth. It was only necessary for a man to use his eyes, in order that he might perceive the naked circumstance of *Certain Individuals, out of the great mass of the unbelieving world, being elected into the pale of the visible Church Catholic.*

But, while this IDEALITY of Election itself was maintained, some speculation could scarcely fail, ere long, to arise respecting the CAUSATION of such Election.

It was seen, that, in point of bare fact, certain individuals, out of the unbelieving world, whether jewish or gentile, were elected into the pale of the visible Christian Church; just as, heretofore, certain individuals, out of the midst of the apostatic world of postdiluvian idolatry, had been elected into the pale of the visible Levitical Church: and, in each case alike, it was also seen, that, in point of fact, numerous other individuals were pretermitted or reprobated by the circumstance of their *not* being thus elected.

Hence the question would naturally arise: WHY *some were elected; and* WHY *others were pretermitted?*

To this question no satisfactory answer would be afforded by the remark: that, *When the Gospel was openly preached and freely offered, those, who rejected it, stood, by their own*

voluntary act and by their own free choice, excluded from the Church.

For, to such an answer, the obvious reply would be: that *Many had never heard the sound of the Gospel at all; and, consequently, had never had even a simple opportunity of choice offorded to them.*

The difficulty, which I have stated, was probably *felt* in the Church from the very beginning: but, however this may be, it was certainly perceived so early as the latter end of the second century; and the solution of it, which was then attempted, soon, from its plausibility, became fashionable, and has, in truth, through the pretty extensive prevalence of Arminianism, continued to be fashionable down even to the present time.

It was thought: that *The difficulty might be satisfactorily removed, by calling in, as the moving* CAUSE *of Election, God's undoubted foreknowledge of man's future actions, and by thus making Election itself to depend upon the previsionally anticipated goodness or badness of those actions.*

I. On this point, both an assertion and an admission, of far too wide an extent, have unguardedly, and therefore somewhat incorrectly, been made.

Vossius, and numerous other writers since the age of the Reformation, have roundly asserted: that ALL *the ancient Fathers, whether greek or latin, who lived before Augustine, maintained the impelling* CAUSE *of God's Election to be his foreknowledge of the future holiness of certain individuals; so that from all eternity he elected such individuals,* BECAUSE *he foreknew that they would be devoted to him, and* BECAUSE *their foreseen holiness thus made them fit subjects for God's Election**.

* Græci Patres SEMPER, Patrum Latinorum vero ILLI QUI ANTE AUGUSTINUM VIXERUNT, dicere solent: Eos esse prædestinatos ad vitam,

And Calvin has taken credit to himself for ingenuously admitting: that, *In* ALL *ages, the System, which exhibits God's Foreknowledge of man's future worthiness as the moving* CAUSE *of God's Election, has obtained the patronage of great authors**.

The present statement has been so often made; and that, too, by writers of the highest reputation: that, in the professedly Arminian School, it seems almost to have acquired the rights and privileges of prescription. Yet Prosper, who had much better opportunities of judging than any modern, because he had access to various ecclesiastical documents now no longer in existence, admits not the correctness of any such statement: but, on the contrary, uses phraseology of a much less comprehensive description.

When the Christians of Marseilles objected to Augustine's view of *Election* on the specific ground, that *It was contrary to the opinion of the older Fathers and the received sense of the Church;* and when they professedly defended, what Prosper calls *their obstinacy*, on the distinct plea of *Antiquity:* Prosper wrote to Augustine; and begged for his instructions, as to how he should answer this somewhat

quos Deus piè rectèque victuros prævidit; sive, ut alii loquuntur, quos prævidit crediturosque et perseveraturos. Voss. Hist. Pelag. lib. vi. thes. 8. The opinion of the Greeks *after* Augustine is of no importance to the present question.

* Vulgo existimant Deum, prout cujusque merita fore prævidet, ita inter homines discernere. Quos, ergo, sua gratia fore non indignos præcognoscit, eos in filiorum locum coöptare: quorum ingenia ad malitiam et impietatem propensura dispicit, eos mortis damnationi devovere. Sic, interposito Præscientiæ velo, Electionem non modo obscurant, sed originem aliunde habere fingunt. Neque hæc vulgo recepta opinio solius vulgi est: habuit enim, sæculis OMNIBUS, magnos authores. Quod ingenuè fateor, ne quis causæ nostræ magnopere obfuturum confidat, si eorum nomina contra opponantur. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 22. § 1.

puzzling objection*. At the same time, he added, on his own account: that, *After a reëxamination of the opinions of their predecessors*, ALMOST ALL *were found to agree upon one point: namely, that God's Predestination is according to his Prescience, so that he determines some to be vessels of honour and others to be vessels of dishonour, because he foresees what will be the end of each, and because he foreknows what (through grace in the one case) will be the future will and conduct of each*†.

The state of the matter, then, was this.

For their own system of CAUSATION, the Massilians, in reference to the ancients, put in the plea of *Universality*‡.

In reply, Prosper admits the *general* correctness of their allegation: but, as an act of justice due to the System of CAUSATION espoused by Augustine and himself, he very considerably *modifies* it.

On the strength of his own examination, he states: that *almost all* his predecessors held *God's Foreknowledge of men's future actions* to be the moving CAUSE of God's Predestination.

But, when he says *almost all*: he obviously, by the very necessity of his language, rejects the plea of *Universality*.

* See above, book i. chap. 8. § 1. 2.

† Retractatis priorum de hac re opinionibus, PENE OMNIUM par invenitur et una sententia, qua propositum et prædestinationem Dei secundum præscientiam receperunt: ut, ob hoc, Deus alios vasa honoris, alios contumeliæ, fecerit, quia finem uniuscujusque præviderit; et, sub ipso gratiæ adjutorio, in qua futurus esset voluntate et actione, præviderit. Prosper. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 482, 483.

‡ Obstinationem suam vetustate defendunt: et ea, quæ de Epistola Apostoli Pauli Romanis scribentis, ad manifestationem divinæ gratiæ prævenientis electorum merita proferuntur, A NULLO UNQUAM ECCLESIASTICORUM ita esse intellecta, ut nunc sentiuntur, affirmant. Prosper. Epist. ad August. in Oper. August. vol. vii. p. 482.

The *great bulk* of earlier writers, he fairly admits, acquiesced in the solution favoured by the Massilians: but *some*, he contends, did not adopt it.

II. Doubtless the language of Prosper is the language of a partizan of Augustine; but still, since he asserts *a fact*, he invites us to a more full or at least to a more severe examination of the present subject. For it naturally raises the very important question: *Whether the scheme of* CAUSATION, *advocated by the Massilians, was coëval with the Christian Church herself;* or *Whether, for the purpose of meeting a difficulty which could not but be soon felt and acknowledged, it was excogitated, from a very ancient period indeed, but still not from the beginning.*

1. Let us, then, regularly commence with inquiring into the sentiments of the oldest christian writers who happen to touch upon the doctrine of *Election.*

(1.) By Clement of Rome, the friend and disciple of St. Paul, *God's Election* is, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, nine times mentioned*.

Now, in not one of these nine several places, does he ever represent the moving CAUSE of Election to be *God's prescience of man's future fitness.*

Negatively, therefore, Clement must be struck out of a list which professes the character of *Universality.*

But this is not all. If I mistake not, Clement must be arranged positively in opposition to the scheme of CAUSATION maintained, as the aboriginal system of the Church, by the Christians of Marseilles. This oldest of the Fathers enters not, indeed, directly and professedly into the question: but he intimates not obscurely (the whole Roman Church, let it be remembered, speaking with him); that he deemed *God's*

* Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 1, 2, 6, 29, 46, 49, 50, 52, 58.

clemency and mercy, not *God's prescience of man's future fitness*, to be the impelling CAUSE of God's Election*.

(2.) Ignatius, the pupil of St. John, in the course of his genuine Epistles, thrice mentions either *Election* or *Predestination*†.

Like Clement, this very ancient Father must also be arranged, both negatively and positively, against the universalising claim of the Massilians.

He does *not* assert: that *God elects certain individuals* BECAUSE *he foresees that they will be holy.*

He *does* assert: that *Predestination is* CAUSALLY *founded upon The Sovereign Will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God*‡.

(3.) Hermas, the friend of St. Paul, or at least the very ancient author who writes under the name of *Hermas*, frequently and familiarly speaks of *God's Elect*§.

Negatively, he never intimates: that the CAUSE of God's electing certain individuals was *His prescience of their fitness.*

Positively, he affirms; that God CAUSALLY founded the Church of the Elect by *His own powerful or sovereign Virtue:* and he states, plainly as the CONSEQUENCE, not as the CAUSE, of their election, that the Elect of God should be pure and immaculate‖.

* Ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ εὔσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 29.

† Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. § 1. Epist. ad Tralles. § 1.

‡ Τῇ προωρισμένῃ πρὸ αἰώνων,—ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ—τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. § 1.

§ Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 1. § 3. vis. 2. § 1. 2. vis. 3. § 5. 9. vis. 4. § 2. 3.

‖ Deus,—virtute sua potenti, condidit sanctam Ecclesiam suam, quam

(4.) I know not, that these three very ancient writers, whose testimony is of such supereminent importance, have ever been specifically claimed by those, who, like the Massilians, urge the plea of *Universality:* but Justin Martyr, who stood in the second succession from the Apostles, has been distinctly alleged as a favourer of the Prescientific System.

He speaks, it appears, of *God's foreseeing men's future actions, and of his rewarding them according to their deserts.* Hence, it is urged, he must have taught: that *God's prescience of men's future conduct* is the moving CAUSE either of their Election or of their Reprobation.

I am unable to discern, how such a conclusion legitimately follows from such premises.

The very idea of *Predestination* involves the idea of *Prescience.* God cannot predestinate, unless God foreknows. As Augustine justly remarks: *Predestination cannot exist without Prescience; though Prescience may exist without Predestination**. Accordingly, in point of order, St. Paul makes *God's Prescience* precede *God's Predestination;* not *God's Predestination* precede *God's Prescience.*†

But what has Justin's language to do with *Moving* CAUSATION *in the matter of Election?* The expressions alleged occur in six several passages of his Works: but, in not one

benedixit. Ecce transferet cœlos et montes, colles et maria: et omnia plana fient Electis suis. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. i. § 3.

Alba autem pars superventuri est sæculi, in quo habitabunt Electi Dei: quoniam immaculati et puri erunt Electi Dei in vitam æternam. Herm. Past. lib. i. vis. 4. § 3.

* Prædestinatio, sine Præscientia, non potest esse: potest autem esse, sine Prædestinatione, Præscientia. August. de Prædest. et Persever. lib. 1. c. 10. Oper. vol. vii. p. 489.

† Rom. viii. 29.

of these six passages, does he even so much as mention the term. And, for the establishment of points which (I suppose) nobody will ever dream of controverting; the points, namely, of *God's Prescience* and of *God's moral retribution*: he never once adduces those texts of the New Testament which treat of Predestination; but he always refers, when he refers at all, to the case of prophecy as exemplified in the ancient Hebrew Scriptures*.

Negatively, therefore, Justin never asserts: that *God's prescience of the fitness of certain individuals* is the moving CAUSE of their Election.

* I subjoin the six passages; which, so far as I know, are the *only* passages wherein Justin speaks of God's Prescience as connected with God's Moral Retribution: in order that the reader may judge for himself.

Ὅτι λαὸς, ὁ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν προεγνωσμένος, μελετήσειν φόβον Κυρίου προέγνωστο, αὗται αἱ λέξεις τῆς προφητείας βοῶσι. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 231.

Εἰ δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ προμηνύει πάντως τινὰς καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀνθρώπους κολασθήσεσθαι μέλλοντας, διότι προεγίνωσκεν αὐτοὺς ἀμεταβλήτους γενησομένους πονηροὺς, προεῖπε ταῦτα· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅτι αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς τοιούτους ἐποίησεν. Ibid. p. 290.

Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὑμῶν, ὡς νομίζω, τολμήσει εἰπεῖν, ὅτι μὴ καὶ προγνώστης τῶν γίνεσθαι μελλόντων ἦν καὶ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ τὰ ἄξια ἑκάστῳ προετοιμάζων. Ibid. p. 180, 181.

Προγινώσκει γὰρ τίνας ἐκ μετανοίας σωθήσεσθαι μέλλοντας, καὶ τίνας μηδέπω ἴσως γεννηθέντας. Justin. Apol. 1. p. 55.

Τὰς τίμωρίας καὶ τὰς κολάσεις, καὶ τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἀμοιβὰς, κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἑκάστου ἀποδίδοσθαι, διὰ τῶν προφητῶν μαθόντες, καὶ ἀληθὲς ἀποφαινόμεθα. Ibid. p. 62.

Προγνώστου τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄντος τῶν μελλόντων ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων πραχθήσεσθαι· καὶ δόγματος ὄντος παρ' αὐτῶν, κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἕκαστον ἀμείψεσθαι μέλλοντα τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πραττομένων ἀπαντήσεσθαι· διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος προλέγει,—δεικνὺς, ὅτι καὶ μέλον ἐστιν αὐτῷ, καὶ προνοεῖται αὐτῶν. Ibid. p. 64.

But we may advance a step further.

Justin, in so many words indeed, never says positively; that the moving CAUSE of Election is *God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure:* but, in the only two places where he mentions Election, his language is such as inevitably to imply it.

We Christians are no mere contemptible mob:—but God hath also ELECTED *us; and hath manifested himself to those, who inquired not after him.—And we have now come out from the polity in which we lived, living wickedly according to the common practices of the other inhabitants of the earth*.*

Inasmuch as he took out of all nations the nation of the Jews, a nation useless and disobedient and faithless: he hath shewn, that THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN ELECTED *out of every nation are, through Christ, obedient to his counsel†.*

According to Justin, God elects those, who not only never inquired after him, but who like the other inhabitants of the earth were even living in a state of open wickedness: and, though, in CONSEQUENCE of their Election, they are afterward, through Christ, obedient to his counsel; yet the image and exemplar of their Election was the Election of the Jews, a nation similarly useless and disobedient and faithless.

Such being the case, in the estimation of Justin, the moving CAUSE of Election cannot be *God's Prevision of man's fitness and worthiness.*

But, if *God's Prevision of man's fitness and worthiness*

* Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος ὄχλος ἐσμὲν·—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτόν.—Καὶ ἐξήλθομεν ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἐν ᾗ ἐζῶμεν, κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς γῆς οἰκητόρων κακῶς ζῶντες. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 272.

† Ἐκ πάντων δὲ τῶν γενῶν, γένος ἑαυτῇ λαβὼν τὸ ἡμέτερον, γένος ἄχρηστον καὶ ἀπειθὲς καὶ ἄπιστον, ὁείξας τοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς γένους αἱρουμένους πεπεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τῇ βουλῇ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 282.

cannot, in Justin's estimation, be the moving CAUSE of Election: it is hard to say, what he can have deemed its moving CAUSE, save, as in the matter of the Election of the Israelites, *God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure**.

(5.) Like Justin Martyr, his contemporary Irenèus, who similarly stood in the second succession from the Apostles, has also been claimed as an advocate of the same Conditional Prescientific System: but, in truth, like Justin, he really maintained a directly opposite Scheme of CAUSATION.

Negatively, in no one part of his Works, does Irenèus ever say: that the moving CAUSE of God's either Election or Reprobation is *God's Prescience of man's future conduct.*

The expressions, evidentially referred to, occur in four several places of his Work against Heresies.

He states: that *God, since he foreknows all things, has delivered up to their infidelity those, who, he knew, would not believe*†; that *God, foreknowing all things, has prepared suitable habitations both for the good and for the bad*‡; that *Scripture demonstrates God's Prescience, by the intimation that eternal fire is prepared for transgressors*§; and, finally, that *We were predestinated, when as yet we had no existence, according to the foreknowledge of the Father*‖.

* Deut. vii. 6–10. ix. 4–29.

† Quotquot scit non credituros Deus, cum sit omnium præcognitor, tradidit eos infidelitati eorum. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 48. p. 284.

‡ Deus autem, omnia præsciens, utrisque aptas præparavit habitationes. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 76. p. 312.

§ Quoniam autem transgressoribus ignis æternus præparatus est; et Dominus manifestè dixit, et reliquæ demonstrant Scripturæ. Et, quoniam Deus præsciit hoc futurum; similiter demonstrant Scripturæ, quemadmodum et ignem æternum his qui transgressuri sunt præparavit ab initio. Iren. adv. hær. lib. ii. c. 49. p. 150.

‖ Prædestinati quidem ut essemus, qui nondum eramus, secundum

In all these four places, nothing is asserted, save the bare fact of *God's Foreknowledge:* a fact, which no one probably will be disposed to controvert*. Meanwhile, not a syllable is said, as to *God's Prescience of men's future characters* being the moving CAUSE either of their Election or of their Rejection.

But, as, negatively, Irenèus never maintains the Conditional Prescientific Scheme: so, positively, he advocates a System of CAUSATION altogether different.

Those, who allege in evidence the four passages which have been brought under our consideration, ought also, in fairness, to have made it known: that, when Irenèus is *really* speaking of the CAUSE of Election, he distinctly pronounces it to be, not *God's Prevision of men's future conduct*, but simply *God's own inscrutable Purpose and Wisdom.*

Thus, while he assigns *God's general Prescience* as the reason, why he loved Jacob and hated Esau: he cites, with unreserved submission, so far as the CAUSE of Election and Rejection is concerned, St. Paul's explicit declaration; that *The Election of Jacob and the Rejection of Esau, in the persons of their respective descendants, rested alike on the Sovereign Purpose of God,* NOT *of works, but of him that calleth*†.

And thus, when he speaks, of the Election of the Gentiles

præscientiam Patris, facti autem initium futuræ, accipiemus in præcognitis temporibus secundum ministrationem Verbi. Iren. adv. hær. lib. v. c. 1. p. 316, 317.

* When these four places have been adduced, *every* place, in the Work of Irenèus, which speaks of *God's Prescience* as connected with *God's Moral Retribution*, has, I believe, been adduced.

† Et ea autem, quæ circa Isaac, non sine significatione sunt. In ea enim Epistola, quæ est ad Romanos, ait Apostolus: *Sed et Rebecca, ex uno concubitu habens Isaac patris nostri, a Verbo responsum accepit, ut*

into the Church at *one* time rather than at *another* time, and of their very Election itself at *any* season rather than their protracted Preterition through *all* seasons: instead of saying, that God elected certain gentile individuals into the Church rather than certain other gentile individuals, BECAUSE he foreknew, that the former would be fit, and that the latter would be unfit; he plainly alleges *God's own inscrutable Purpose and Wisdom* to be the impelling CAUSE, when he devoutly takes up the exclamation of the Apostle: *O the depth of the riches both of the Wisdom and of the Knowledge of God: how unsearchable are his Judgments; and his Ways, past finding out* !*

2. Hitherto, then, in the very earliest age of the Church, our inquiries after the alleged universal solution, that *God's Foreknowledge of men's future fitness* is the moving CAUSE of *God's Predestination*, have proved fruitless. For, in truth, five of the most ancient of the Fathers assign, as its moving

secundum Electionem propositum Dei permaneat; non ex operibus, sed ex vocante. Dictum est ei: Duo enim populi in utero tuo; et duæ gentes in ventre tuo: et populus populum superabit; et major serviet minori. Ex quibus manifestum est, non solum prophetationes patriarcharum, sed et partum Rebeccæ, prophetiam fuisse duorum populorum.—Unus et idem Deus noster et illorum: qui est absconsorum cognitor; qui scit omnia, antequam fiant; et propter hoc dicens, *Jacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui.* Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 38. p. 272.

* Διὰ τι συνέκλεισε πάντα εἰς ἀπείθειαν ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ, ἐξερευνᾶν·—καὶ διὰ τι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν καιρῶν ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπαγγέλλειν·—καὶ τι ὅτι τὰ ἀπεγνωσμένα ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῶν ἁγίων πεποίηκεν ὁ Θεὸς, μὴ σιωπᾶν·—πῶς τε ἐρει, ὁ οὐ λαὸς λαὸς, καὶ ἡ οὐκ ἠγαπημένη ἠγαπημένη, καὶ πῶς πλείονα τῆς ἐρήμου τὰ τέκνα μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα, κηρύσσειν· ἐπὶ τούτων γὰρ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς, ἐπεβόησεν ὁ ἀπόστολος, Ω῏ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως Θεοῦ, ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ. Iren. adv. hær. lib. i. c. 4. p. 38.

CAUSE, not *God's Foreknowledge of men's future fitness or unfitness*, but *God's absolute and inscrutable Will and Sovereignty:* while others of the same antiquity, such as Polycarp and Theophilus and Athenagoras, never enter upon the subject at all under *any* aspect.

Toward the end, however, of the second century, the Prescientific Solution makes its appearance, distinctly enounced, but (so far as I have been able to ascertain) for the *first* time enounced, by the speculative Clement of Alexandria.

We say: that There is one only ancient and catholic Church, which, into the unity of one Faith that is according to its proper covenants or rather according to its single covenant evolved in different periods, collects together, by the will of one God through one Lord, those already ordained: WHOM GOD HATH PREDESTINATED, AS KNOWING, BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD, THAT THEY WOULD BE JUST*.

Here we have the Prescientific Solution propounded fully and unequivocally: and, at a subsequent time, we find it set forth with equal distinctness by the Pseudo-Ambrose.

Those are called according to God's purpose, WHO, HE FOREKNEW, WOULD, BY BELIEVING, BE FIT FOR HIM: *so that, before they believed, they should be known. For, whom he foreknew, those also he predestinated.* HE ELECTED, TO RECEIVE THE PROMISED REWARDS, THOSE, WHO, HE FOREKNEW, WOULD BE DEVOTED TO HIM†.

* Μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφόροις τοῖς χρόνοις, ἑνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βουλήματι δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκὼς. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. Oper. p. 765.

† Hi autem secundum propositum vocantur, quos credentes præscivit

No doubt can be entertained as to the import of this language: and, after the time of Clement and down to the time of Augustine, the solution before us may be broadly said to have met with something very like universal acceptation.

Yet, even during this period, such was the vitality of the most ancient Scheme of CAUSATION, we occasionally encounter an appearance either of hesitation or of inconsistency, by whatever name we may choose to call it.

I shall exemplify my meaning by the case of the celebrated Jerome: who was contemporary with, though in part somewhat prior to, Augustine.

(1.) The language of Jerome, in more than one place, is such, that we might well pronounce him to have adopted unreservedly the Prescientific Solution recommended by Clement of Alexandria.

To predestinate is the same as to foreknow. Those therefore, who, God foresaw, would be conformed to the image of his Son in life, he willed should also be conformed to it in glory.*

Who, he foreknew, would believe, those he called. But vocation gathers together the willing, not the unwilling. Or, at least, whatever difference is made, it is made, not in the persons, but in the time†.

Deus futuros sibi idoneos: ut, antequam crederent, scirentur. *Nam, quos præscivit, et prædestinavit.* Istos, quos præscivit futuros sibi devotos, ipsos elegit ad promissa præmia capessenda. Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. viii. in Oper. Ambros. p. 1846.

* *Prædestinare* idem est quod *præscire.* Ergo, quos prævidit conformes futuros in vita, voluit ut fierent conformes in gloria. Hieron. Comment. in Rom. viii. 29. Oper. vol. viii. p. 177.

† Quos præscivit credituros, hos vocavit. Vocatio autem volentes colligit, non invitos. Aut certè discretio, non in personis, sed in tempore, est. Hieron. Comment. in Rom. viii. 30. Oper. vol. viii. p. 177.

The goodness and clemency of God hardens the vessels of wrath which are fitted to destruction, that is to say, the people of Israel: but the vessels of mercy, which he hath prepared for glory and which he hath called, that is to say, us, who are not only of the Jews but also of the Gentiles, he saves, not without reason and without truth of judgment, but from preceding causes; namely, because some received not the Son of God, but others willingly received him of their own accord. These vessels of mercy are, not only the people of the Gentiles, but likewise those who out of the Jews were willing to believe: for the two were made one people of believers. Whence it is shewn: that not the nations, but the wills, of men, are elected.*

The love and hatred of God, as illustrated by the Apostle in the case of Jacob and Esau, spring, either from his foreknowledge of things future, or from men's works. Otherwise, we know: that God loves all things, nor hates any of the things which he created; but that he properly claims, for the exercise of his love, those, who are enemies and opponents of vice; and, on the contrary, that he hates those, who wish to build up again what God has destroyed†.

* Bonitas et clementia Dei, vasa iræ, quæ apta sunt in interitum, id est, populum Israel, indurat: vasa autem misericordiæ, quæ præparavit in gloriam, quæ vocavit, hoc est, nos, qui non solum ex Judæis sumus sed etiam ex gentibus, non salvat irrationabiliter et absque judicii veritate, sed causis præcedentibus; quia alii non susceperunt Filium Dei, alii autem recipere sua sponte voluerunt. Hæc autem vasa misericordiæ non solum populus gentium est, sed etiam ii qui ex Judæis credere voluerunt: et unus credentium effectus est populus. Ex quo ostenditur: non gentes eligi, sed hominum voluntates. Hieron. ad Hedib. Epist. cl. quæst. 10. Oper. vol. iii. p. 353.

† Dilectio et odium Dei, vel ex præscientia nascitur futurorum, vel ex operibus: alioquin novimus, quod omnia Deus diligat, nec quidquam eorum oderit quæ creavit; sed propriè eos suæ vindicet charitati, qui

(2.) And yet this very Jerome occasionally theologises in a directly opposite strain: and, what is very remarkable as shewing the strong hold which the primitive System of CAUSATION long retained upon the minds and memories of men, he even specially alleges, that that System exhibits the ecclesiastical sense of the words of the Apostle Paul.

No one, from the beginning of the world, is elected and fitted to the celestial edifice, through his own virtue: but he is rather so elected, through the operation of him, who, appointing all things in weight and measure, distributes to each one, AS HE HATH WILLED, *the measure of faith and graces*.*

The attestation of the Apostle, that We were elected in order that we might be holy and immaculate before God, *appertains to God's foreknowledge: for, to him, all future things are already done; and all things are known, before they come to pass.—But another writer, Origen to wit, attempts to prove the justice of God, on the ground: that He elects each person, not from his simple exercise of inherent foreknowledge, but from the merit of the individuals elected.—Paul, however, says not:* He elected us before the foundation of the world, when we were holy and immaculate. *But he says:* He elected us, that we might be holy and immaculate. *In other words: God elected us, who were not previously holy and immaculate, in order that hereafter we might become so*†.

vitiorum hostes sunt et rebelles; et, e contrario, illos odit, qui a Deo destructa cupiunt rursum extruere. Hieron. Comment. in Malac. i. 2, 3. Oper. vol. v. p. 276.

* Nullus igitur, ab initio sæculi, sua virtute electus et cœlesti ædificio aptus est: sed potius ejus opere, qui, omnia in pondere et mensura et numero constituens, unicuique, sicut voluit, mensuram fidei et gratiarum distribuit. Hieron. Comment. in Proverb. xvi. 11. Oper. vol. viii. p. 95.

† Quod autem *electos nos, ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso,*

In expounding the testimony of Paul, when he says ; As God elected us in himself before the foundation of the world, that we might be holy and immaculate before him :—*we did but follow* THE ECCLESIASTICAL SENSE *of the words.—For the Apostle says not:* God elected us before the foundation of the world, when we were holy and immaculate. *But he says :* God elected us, in order that we might be holy and immaculate. *In other words : God elected us, that we, who before were not holy and immaculate, might afterward become so : language, which applies to the cause of sinners converted to better things. Thus that sentence,* In thy sight shall no man living be justified, *will stand good*.*

Presumptuously dare, then, to object to God that stronger calumny : Wherefore it was, that, while Esau and Jacob were still in the womb, God should have said ; Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.—*Object, likewise, as your comrade Porphyry was wont to do :* On what ground it was,

hoc est Deo, *ante fabricam mundi*, testatus est ; ad præscientiam Dei pertinet : cui omnia futura jam facta sunt ; et, antequam fiant, universa sunt nota.—Alius vero, qui Deum justum conatur ostendere, quod, non ex præjudicio scientiæ suæ, sed ex merito electorum, unumquemque eligat.—Non autem ait Paulus : *Elegit nos ante constitutionem mundi, cum essemus sancti et immaculati ;* sed *Elegit nos, ut essemus sancti et immaculati ;* hoc est, qui sancti et immaculati ante non fuimus, ut postea essemus. Hieron. Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes. i. Oper. vol. vi. p. 162.

* Testimonium Pauli, in quo loquitur, *Sicut elegit in ipso nos ante constitutionem mundi, ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso :* sic interpretati sumus, ut—ecclesiasticum sensum secuti simus.—Non enim ait apostolus : *Elegit nos ante constitutionem mundi, cum essemus sancti et immaculati ;* sed *Elegit nos, ut essemus sancti et immaculati :* hoc est, qui sancti et immaculati ante non fuimus, ut postea essemus ; quod et de peccatoribus, ad meliora conversis, dici potest. Et stabit illa sententia : *Non justificabitur in conspectu tuo omnis vivens.* Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruffin. lib. i. c. 6. Oper. vol. ii. p. 199.

that a clement and merciful God, from Adam down to Moses, and from Moses down to the coming of Christ, suffered all nations to perish through ignorance of the Law and Commandments of God. For neither Britain, nor the Irish Tribes, nor all those barbarous nations in a circuit as far as to the ocean, had known Moses and the Prophets. What need was there, that he should come in the last time, and not before an innumerable multitude of men should have perished? *Which question, the blessed Apostle, writing to the Romans, most prudently discusses: simply confessing his ignorance of these matters, and humbly submitting to* THE WISDOM OF GOD. *Deign, therefore, thou also, to be ignorant of the matters into which thou inquirest. Be content to concede to God* POWER OVER HIS OWN. *He wants not thee for a defender*.*

In his exposition of the words of St. Paul, *God elected us that we might be holy and immaculate*, Jerome is opposing the wild speculation of Origen respecting the preëxistence of souls and his vain attempt to vindicate the justice of God on the plea that the moving CAUSE of Election is *The merit*

* Objice Deo fortiorem calumniam: *Quare adhuc, cum in utero essent Esau et Jacob; dixerit; Jacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui.*— Et, ad extremum, quod solet nobis objicere contubernalis vester Porphyrius: *Qua ratione, clemens, et misericors Deus, ab Adam usque ad Moysen, et a Moyse usque ad adventum Christi, passus sit universas gentes perire ignorantia Legis et Mandatorum Dei. Neque enim Britannia fertilis provincia tyrannorum, et Stoicæ* (qu. Scoticæ) *gentes, omnesque usque ad oceanum per circuitum barbaræ nationes, Moysen prophetasque cognoverant. Quid necesse fuit eum in ultimo venire tempore, et non priusquam innumerabilis periret hominum multitudo?* Quam quæstionem beatus apostolus, ad Romanos scribens, prudentissimè ventilat, ignorans hæc, et Dei concedens scientiæ. Dignare igitur et tu ista nescire, quæ quæris. Concede Deo potentiam sui: nequaquam te indiget defensore. Hieron. adv. Pelag. ad Ctesiphon. c. 4. Oper. vol. ii. p. 223.

of man in a prior state. But this circumstance affects, neither the force of his argument, nor the drift of his testimony. From St. Paul's express words, he rightly insists; that *Holiness* is the CONSEQUENCE, not the CAUSE, of Election: and he distinctly bears witness; that, *Whatever deviations may have taken place in later times, such is the true Ecclesiastical Sense annexed to the language of the Apostle.*

3. By the mere force of evidence, then, I am led to conclude; that the strictly Primitive Church assigned *God's merciful, though inscrutable, Sovereignty, displayed in the exercise of his Supreme Will and Pleasure,* as the alone moving CAUSE of Election: and my persuasion is collaterally confirmed, both by what I must needs call the very necessity of the case, and by what might have been well anticipated as the sure and certain consequence of adopting Clement's new System of CAUSATION.

(1.) Let us first attend to the very necessity of the case.

According to the view constantly taken by the early Church, the IDEALITY of Election was: not *An Election of certain individuals, out of the great mass of mankind, immediately and directly, to eternal happiness in the next world;* but *An Election of certain individuals, out of the great mass both of the Gentiles and of the Jews, into the pale of the visible Church in this world, with the object and intention indeed of their obtaining eternal happiness hereafter, but still through their own perverse unholiness with the full moral possibility of their not attaining it.*

Now it is perfectly clear: that an Election of *this* description *cannot* rest, as its moving CAUSE, upon *God's foreknowledge of the future fitness of the individuals thus elected.*

For, if *God's foreknowledge of the fitness of the individuals* were the moving CAUSE of their Election into the Church: then, by the very necessity of the case, none either would

or could be elected into the pale of the visible Church, save those individuals whose future fitness and holiness God foreknew.

If, however, none were elected into the pale of the visible Church save those individuals whose fitness and holiness God foreknew: then, by the actual terms of the proposition, there neither would nor could, within the pale of the visible Church, be a single individual, who, at the time of his death, would be found personally unfit or unholy.

But it is evident, that too many individuals both habitually live and finally die, personally unfit and unholy, within the pale of that visible Church, into which, nevertheless, they have been elected.

Therefore, clearly, the impelling CAUSE of the Election of such unfit and unholy individuals into the pale of the visible Church *cannot* be *God's foreknowledge of their future fitness and holiness:* for *a foreknowledge of the fitness of the permanently unfit*, or *a foreknowledge of the holiness of the permanently unholy*, were a palpable and direct contradiction.

(2.) Let us next attend to what might have been well anticipated, as the sure and certain consequence of adopting the novel System of CAUSATION.

It is strange, that the obvious result of his proposed solution should not instantly have occurred to Clement himself: and it is still more strange, that such a result should not have immediately prevented the very general supplantation of the more reasonable and more consistent doctrine of the Church of the two first centuries.

Yet so it was. Nevertheless, as might naturally be expected, the inconsistency of *the moving* CAUSE *of Election as laid down by Clement*, with *the primitive* IDEALITY *of Election itself*, was not always unfelt: and, after a fruitless attempt at reconciliation had been made, a final abandonment

of first principles at length produced the Theory which is now called *Arminianism.*

Accordingly, a conscious feeling of this very inconsistency began, as an evident attempt to reconcile irreconcileable incongruities, with calling forth a still further innovation upon the primeval System of doctrine: an innovation, which *now* respected the point of IDEALITY.

This further innovation was propounded by the writer under the name of Ambrose: who, as we have seen, maintained the CAUSE of Election to be *God's prevision of man's future merit or fitness.*

Now, that the Pseudo-Ambrose perceived and felt the inconsistency before us, we may gather not obscurely from his attempt to evade or to parry it.

The attempt consisted, in an arbitrary modification of the ancient IDEALITY of the term *Elect*, and thence in an arbitrary division of the Elect themselves into two classes.

Though, following Clement, he distinctly states; that *God elected those, who he foreknew would be devoted to him, or who he foreknew would possess a fitness for their Election:* yet he tells us, that God has elected *some* individuals into the Church *permanently*, BECAUSE he foresaw that they would persevere in holiness and would thus attain eternal life: while *other* individuals he has elected indeed into the Church but *not permanently*, BECAUSE he foresaw that through inaptitude they would not persevere in holiness and would thus fail of attaining eternal life*.

* Hi autem secundum propositum vocantur, quos credentes præscivit Deus futuros sibi idoneos; ut, antequam crederent, scirentur. *Nam, quos præscivit, et prædestinavit.* Istos, quos præscivit futuros sibi devotos, ipsos elegit ad promissa præmia capessenda: ut hi, qui credere videntur et non permanent in fide coepta, a Deo electi negentur: quia, quos Deus elegit, apud se permanent. Est enim, qui ad tempus eligi-

Such a gloss, incongruous as it is with the very principle upon which it proceeds, would never have been devised, had not the utter inconsistency of *primitive* IDEALITY and *more modern* CAUSATION, forcibly united together by Clement in a single sentence, been felt and perceived*.

In truth, the Scheme of CAUSATION, struck out by Clement of Alexandria, can never be coherently adopted, unless the whole Scheme of primeval IDEALITY be relinquished. This was, at length, effected, by the introduction of the System which usually bears the name of *Arminianism*. Here, the Scheme of CAUSATION, first invented by Clement of Alexandria, was unreservedly taken up. But then the primeval Scheme of IDEALITY was entirely discarded: for, instead of Election being deemed, as of old, *An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Church;* it was now deemed *An Election of certain individuals immediately and directly to eternal life.*

By such a plan, incongruity was, no doubt, avoided: for a System was contrived, in which the new clementine Scheme of CAUSATION might be adopted without the ignominy of self-contradiction. But, to effect this purpose, the

tur, sicut Saul et Judas, non de præscientia, sed de præsenti justitia. *Quos autem prædestinavit, illos et vocavit :—et, quos vocavit, ipsos et justificavit : quos autem justificavit, hos et magnificavit.* Hoc dicit quod supra, quia, quos præscivit Deus aptos sibi, hi credentes permanent, quia aliter fieri non potest: nisi, quos præscivit Deus, ipsos et justificavit; ac, per hoc, et magnificavit illos, ut similes fiant Filio Dei. De cæteris, quos non præscivit Deus (scil. futuros sibi aptos), non est illi cura in hanc gratiam, quia non (scil. ita) præsciit. Ac si credant aut eligantur ad tempus quia videntur boni, ne justitia contempta videatur, non permanent ut magnificentur, sicut et Judas Scarioth, aut illi septuaginta duo, qui electi, post scandalum passi, recesserunt a Salvatore. Comment. in Rom. viii. in Oper. Ambros. p. 1846, 1847.

* See the passage above, book ii. chap. 3. § II. 2.

whole original System of Doctrine, both in point of IDEALITY and in point of CAUSATION, was *altogether* abandoned: and a System, in every respect *completely* novel, was in its place substituted*.

III. The sum of the inquiry, with the necessary conclusion from it, is this.

1. In the apostolically directed judgment of the Church of the two first centuries, God's decree of Election ought, as its moving CAUSE, to be referred solely to *The good Pleasure of God's merciful though absolute Sovereignty.*

2. But, from a vain though well meant wish to vindicate God's Justice which apparently was thought to be impeached by the earliest view of the question, Clement of Alexandria, toward the end of the second century, first started the very plausible solution: that *God's Prescience of men's future righteousness* is the impelling CAUSE of his decree of Election.

3. Hence, from the very necessity of chronology, the solution of Clement, however widely it might afterward be adopted, is a mere unauthorised private novelty: and hence, agreeably to the wise canon of Tertullian, it must be rejected; while the ancient Scheme, which held forth *God's Sovereign Pleasure* as the moving CAUSE of Election and which exhibited the IDEALITY of Election as *An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible church*, must, unless indeed it shall be found hopelessly irreconcileable with Scripture, be retained.

* Arminianism has rejected both the IDEALITY and the CAUSATION of Election, as that doctrine was understood in the strictly Primitive Church: Calvinism has retained the CAUSATION, but has rejected the IDEALITY: Nationalism, as propounded by Locke, has distorted the IDEALITY, but has retained the CAUSATION. Thus, of the three Systems, Arminianism has the *most* widely departed from aboriginal Christian Antiquity: for, in truth, it has *altogether* forsaken it.

IV. Having now evidentially ascertained the System of Doctrine inculcated by the earliest Church, I may proceed to inquire, how far, both in point of IDEALITY and in point of CAUSATION, it will agree with the System of Doctrine taught in the inspired Scriptures whether of the Old Testament or of the New Testament.

Should it, by the too plain construction of language, hopelessly disagree: we must then admit the canon of Tertullian to be nullified.

But, should it, in both points, be found remarkably to agree: we shall then perceive the admirable soundness of a canon, which, in the knotty question of *Election*, has happily brought us to a moral certainty of having developed the truth.

CHAPTER IV.

THE IDEALITY OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE LAW.

The phraseology of the Gospel greatly depends upon the phraseology of the Law; for the ancient Levitical Church was the appointed type and exemplar of its successor the Christian Church.

Accordingly, the terms *Elect* or *Chosen* are, in no wise, peculiar to the Gospel: under the Law itself, they occur, perhaps, quite as frequently; though, from the circumstance of our translators generally employing the term *Elect* in the New Testament while they generally employ the term *Chosen* in the Old Testament, a less vivid impression is, I believe, made upon the mind of the cursory reader of the more ancient Scriptures.

I. In order to ascertain the sense, wherein the terms (or rather, to speak more accurately, the term) *Elect* or *Chosen* must be viewed, as having been used by the sacred writers under the Law: let us attend to some of the many passages, in which their IDEALITY, according to the view taken of it by those writers, is plainly and distinctly set forth.

I shall simply give the passages themselves, before any remarks are made upon their drift and purport.

1. *The Lord hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him* A PEOPLE OF INHERITANCE, *as ye are this day.—Because he loved thy fathers, therefore he* CHOSE *their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt**.

* Deut. iv. 20, 37.

2. *I am the Lord your God, which have* SEPARATED *you from other people.—Ye shall be holy unto me: for I the Lord am holy, and have* SEVERED *you from other people that ye should be mine**.

3. *Thou art* AN HOLY PEOPLE *unto the Lord thy God. The Lord thy God* HATH CHOSEN *thee to be* A SPECIAL PEOPLE *unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth*†.

4. *The Lord thy God hath avouched thee this day to be* HIS PECULIAR PEOPLE, *as he hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep his commandments; and to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise and in name and in honour; and that thou mayest be* AN HOLY PEOPLE *unto the Lord thy God*‡.

5. *Thou art* AN HOLY PEOPLE *unto the Lord thy God: and the Lord* HATH CHOSEN *thee to be* A PECULIAR PEOPLE *unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth*§.

6. *Thy servant is in the midst of* THY PEOPLE *which thou* HAST CHOSEN: *a great people, which cannot be numbered nor counted for multitude*‖.

7. *The Lord said: I will remove* JUDAH *also out of my sight, as I have removed* ISRAEL: *and I will cast off* THIS CITY JERUSALEM *which* I HAVE CHOSEN, *and the house of which I said My name shall be there*¶.

8. *Thou art the Lord the God, who* DIDST CHOOSE *Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham***.

9. *Blessed is* THE NATION, *whose God is the Lord; and* THE PEOPLE, *whom he* HATH CHOSEN *for his own inheritance*††.

10. *He remembered his holy promise, and Abraham his*

* Levit. xx. 24, 26.
‡ Deut. xxvi. 18, 19.
‖ 1 Kings iii. 8.
** Nehem. ix. 7.
† Deut. vii. 6.
§ Deut. xiv. 2.
¶ 2 Kings xxiii. 27.
†† Psalm xxxiii. 12.

servant: and he brought forth HIS PEOPLE *with joy, and* HIS CHOSEN *with gladness;—that they might observe his statutes, and keep his laws*.*

11. *Remember me, O Lord, with the favour that thou bearest unto* THY PEOPLE; *O visit me with thy salvation: that I may see the good of* THY CHOSEN, *that I may rejoice in the gladness of* THY NATION, *that I may glory with* THINE INHERITANCE†.

12. *The Lord* HATH CHOSEN *unto himself* JACOB; *even* ISRAEL, *for* HIS PECULIAR TREASURE‡.

13. *For the Lord will have mercy on* JACOB; *and* ISRAEL *he yet* WILL CHOOSE: *and he will set them in their own land; and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob*§.

14. *But thou,* ISRAEL, *art my servant;* JACOB, *whom* I HAVE CHOSEN; *the* SEED OF ABRAHAM *my friend: thou, whom I have taken from the ends of the earth; and called thee from the chief men thereof; and said unto thee: Thou art my servant;* I HAVE CHOSEN THEE, *and not cast thee away*‖.

15. *I give waters in the wilderness and rivers in the desert, to give drink to* MY PEOPLE, *to* MY CHOSEN. *This* PEOPLE *have I formed for myself: they shall shew forth my praise*¶.

16. *Yet now hear, O* JACOB *my servant; and* ISRAEL, *whom I* HAVE CHOSEN: *thus saith the Lord, that made thee and formed thee from the womb, which will help thee; Fear not, O* JACOB *my servant; and thou,* JESURUN, *whom* I HAVE CHOSEN**.

17. *For* JACOB *my servant's sake, and* ISRAEL *mine* ELECT, *I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me*††.

* Psalm cv. 42, 43, 45.
† Psalm cvi. 4, 5.
‡ Psalm cxxxv. 4.
§ Isaiah xiv. 1.
‖ Isaiah xli. 8, 9.
¶ Isaiah xliii. 20, 21.
** Isaiah xliv. 1, 2.
†† Isaiah xlv. 4.

18. *Hear ye this,* O HOUSE OF JACOB, *which are called by the name of* ISRAEL, *and are come forth from the waters of* JUDAH; *which swear by the name of the Lord, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth nor in righteousness.—Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver:* I HAVE CHOSEN THEE, *in the furnace of affliction**.

19. *I will bring forth* A SEED OUT OF JACOB, *and* OUT OF JUDAH AN INHERITOR *of my mountains: and* MINE ELECT *shall inherit it, and* MY SERVANTS *shall dwell there.—They shall not build; and another, inhabit: they shall not plant; and another, eat. For, as the days of a tree, are the days of* MY PEOPLE: *and* MINE ELECT *shall long enjoy the work of their hands*†.

20. *Considerest thou not, what this people have spoken, saying:* THE TWO FAMILIES, *which the Lord* HATH CHOSEN, *he hath even cast them off. Thus have they despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them*‡.

21. *Thus saith the Lord God: In the day, when* I CHOSE ISRAEL, *and lifted up mine hand unto* THE SEED OF THE HOUSE OF JACOB, *and made myself known unto them in the land of Egypt, when I lifted up mine hand unto them, saying, I am the Lord your God:—then said I unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt: I am the Lord your God*§.

22. *Cry yet, saying: Thus saith the Lord of hosts; My cities, through prosperity, shall yet be spread abroad; and the Lord shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet* CHOOSE JERUSALEM‖.

23. *The Lord said unto Satan: The Lord rebuke thee, O*

* Isaiah xlviii. 1, 10.
† Isaiah lxv. 9, 22.
‡ Jerem. xxxiii. 24.
§ Ezek. xx. 5, 7.
‖ Zechar. i. 17.

Satan; even the Lord that HATH CHOSEN JERUSALEM, *rebuke thee**.

II. These several passages have been taken out of various books of the Old Testament: and it is, I think, impossible not to perceive; that, in all of them, with strict harmony, the same IDEALITY of Election is invariably exhibited.

The Election, spoken of, is not *An Election of certain individuals, directly and immediately, to eternal life:* neither is it *An Election of certain nations to the privileges of a religious Society:* but it is *An Election of various individuals of one family, commencing with Abraham and the succeeding patriarchs, and finally comprehending the whole house of Jacob, into a particular Community, which, to the designed purpose of holiness and thence of happiness, should be separated from the great mass of the unbelieving nations.*

Hence, though the object of this Election is *The holiness and happiness of the elected individuals;* and though its end is *The preservation of the pure worship of the one holy God:* yet the Elect themselves, comprising as they did the whole Chosen House of Israel, might have many wicked, as well as many good, persons, among their number.

Hence, also, God's Chosen People who had specially been brought into covenant with him, notwithstanding their Election out of the unbelieving world, and notwithstanding their high privileges in regard to the means of grace, might even ecclesiastically be rejected so that they should be no more the people of the Lord.

In short, the IDEALITY of Election, as the term *Elect* or *Chosen* occurs under the Law, is clearly what I have called *Ecclesiastical Individual Election* or *An Election of certain individuals into a Church.*

* Zechar. iii. 2.

On the general postdiluvian apostasy of mankind from the purity of the ancient Patriarchal Church as preserved in the family of Noah, Abraham and his household were first individually elected to constitute the rudiments of a New Church, which, upon a limited scale, should occupy the place of its now effete predecessor. Afterward, from the household of Abraham, still for the same purpose, were individually elected Isaac and his household: as again, later still, Jacob and his household were similarly elected individually from the household of Isaac.

Here, so far as family was concerned, the process of election stopped: and the rudiments of the New Church were completed. Henceforth, ALL the descendants of Israel were severally elected into the Levitical Church, while the great mass of mankind was left in the darkness of pagan error: and the consequence was, that the title of *God's Chosen People* became the property, not of a FEW Israelites only as contradistinguished from the main body of the Israelites, but of ALL the Israelites collectively as contradistinguished from the great body of the Gentiles who had *not* been thus elected*.

Nor yet were the Gentiles altogether excluded. Proselytes might be admitted into the Congregation or Church of

* This view of the matter, depending simply upon *facts*, is not at all affected by those passages, which justly distinguish, in regard to their *individual* state and character, between the holy and the unholy of the *generically* elected House of Israel. With reference to God's general decree of Election, ALL the Israelites *collectively* are, again and again, denominated *God's Chosen People:* though, *spiritually* and with reference to *individual* character, as the Apostle assures us, and as common sense itself requires, *He is not a Jew which is one outwardly*, and *They are not all Israel which are of Israel.* Rom. ii. 28. ix. 6. Nevertheless, the *fact* still remains unimpeached, that the WHOLE House of Israel is designated by the title of *The Chosen People of the Lord.*

Israel, and thus partake of all the advantages which appertained to the House of Jacob. These individuals then became a portion of the *Elect People of God;* the IDEALITY of *Election* itself, meanwhile, thus remaining unaltered*.

For the whole House of Israel, whether natural or adoptive, was *The Church of the Election:* and, in regard to the IDEALITY of the term *Election*, EVERY individual Israelite and EVERY individual Proselyte was severally one of the Elect, inasmuch as EVERY individual Israelite and EVERY individual Proselyte was severally a chosen member of that Church or Community or Congregation.

But this IDEALITY of Election is precisely the same, as the IDEALITY of Election received and propounded by the Primitive Christian Church.

Therefore, so far as our scriptural inquiry has hitherto extended, the view of *Election*, taken by the Primitive Christian Church, perfectly corresponds with the doctrine of *Election* as exhibited in the Old Testament.

* See Deut. xxiii. 3–8. and Selden de Jur. Natur. et Gent. lib. ii. c. 2, 3.

CHAPTER V.

THE CAUSATION OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE LAW.

FROM the IDEALITY of Election as propounded under the Law, we may next proceed to inquire into the CAUSATION of Election so far as under the same Law it has been authoritatively explained and declared.

I. Here, again, I shall begin with simply giving the passages which respect the present part of my subject.

1. *Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God. The Lord thy God* HATH CHOSEN *thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set his love upon you nor* CHOOSE *you,* BECAUSE *ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but,* BECAUSE *the Lord loved you, and* BECAUSE *he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bond-men, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt**.

2. *Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast the nations out from before thee, saying;* FOR *my righteousness, the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land: but, for the wickedness of these nations, the Lord doth drive them out before thee. Not* FOR *thy righteousness, or* FOR *the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go in to possess their land: but, for the wickedness of these nations, the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that he may*

* Deut. vii. 6–8.

perform the word which the Lord sware unto thy fathers Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. Understand, therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it FOR *thy righteousness: for thou art a stiff-necked people*.*

3. *And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, to keep the commandments of the Lord and his statutes which I command thee this day for thy good? Behold, the heaven, and the heaven of heavens, is the Lord's thy God: the earth also, with all that therein is.* ONLY *the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them: and he* CHOSE *their seed after them even you, above all people, as it is this day. Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your heart: and be* NO MORE *stiff-necked*†.

4. *The Lord hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day.*—BECAUSE *he loved thy fathers, therefore he* CHOSE *their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt*‡.

5. *Thus saith the Lord God: In the day, when I* CHOSE *Israel, and lifted up mine hand unto the seed of the house of Jacob;—then said I unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt.—But I wrought* FOR MY NAME'S SAKE, *that it should not be polluted before the heathen among whom they were, in whose sight I made myself known unto them in bringing them forth out of the land of Egypt.* WHEREFORE *I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. And I gave them my statutes, and*

* Deut. ix. 4–6. † Deut. x. 12–16.

‡ Deut. iv. 20, 37.

*shewed them my judgments: which if a man do, he shall even live in them**.

6. *Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but* UNTO THY NAME *give glory,* FOR THY MERCY AND FOR THY TRUTH'S SAKE†.

II. Little needs to be said on the passages, which have now been cited for the purpose of ascertaining the CAUSATION of Election, as that CAUSATION is propounded under the Law.

Clearly, the moving CAUSE, which produced the Election of the House of Israel, was, not *God's Prevision of their future holiness and uprightness and fitness to be his Chosen People,* but purely *God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure and Regard to his own great name operating upon the love which he entertained for their patriarchal ancestors.*

But the very same sentiments, respecting the CAUSATION of Election into the Christian Church, were entertained by the strictly primitive believers down to the time of Clement of Alexandria and doubtless also (as we may gather from Jerome's opposition to the Scheme of Origen) by many pious believers after his time.

Therefore, here again, the doctrine of the strictly Primitive Christian Church exactly agrees with the doctrine propounded in the Old Testament.

* Ezek. xx. 5–11. † Psalm cxv. 1.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IDEALITY OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE GOSPEL.

HAVING ascertained the IDEALITY of Election as propounded under the Law, we are naturally led to expect, that the same IDEALITY of Election will appear also under the Gospel. For it seems highly improbable at least, if not well nigh impossible: that the inspired writers of the New Testament should, without the slightest intimation of the change, use a most important term, together with its cognate dependent terms, in a sense totally *different* from that wherein it had been previously used by the inspired writers of the Old Testament.

As I wish not, however, in an inquiry of this nature, to take any thing for granted; I shall now proceed to investigate the IDEALITY of Election, as it is propounded under the Gospel.

I. I have intimated: that the inspired writers of the New Testament no where tell us, that they use the term *Election*, with its dependent terms *Elect* and *Chosen*, in a sense *different* from that wherein it is used by the inspired writers of the Old Testament. Now this may well be the case, since we distinctly learn from St. Paul, that the terms, whether under the Law or under the Gospel, are used in the very *same* sense.

1. The present important fact we gather from a remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Romans: which, in the way of explanation, immediately follows what the Apostle

had been saying on the topic of *Christian Predestination and Election.*

They are not all Israel, which are of Israel. Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but, In Isaac, shall thy seed be called. That is: They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise: At this time will I come; and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this: but, when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac (the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to Election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth); it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger: as it is written; Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.

What shall we say, then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses: I will have mercy, on whom I will have mercy; and I will have compassion, on whom I will have compassion. So then it is, not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth; but of God that sheweth mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh: Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy, on whom he will have mercy: and, whom he will, he hardeneth.

Thou wilt say, then, unto me: Why doth he yet find fault; for who hath resisted his will?

Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it: Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to shew his

wrath and to make his power known, endured, with much long-suffering, the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory, even us whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Osee: I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her, beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass: that, in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called The children of the living God.—

What shall we say, then? We will say: that The Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.—

But I say: Did not Israel know? First, Moses saith: I will provoke you to jealousy by them which are no people; and, by a foolish nation, I will anger you. But Esaias is very bold, and saith: I was found of them, that sought me not; I was manifested unto them, that asked not after me. But, to Israel, he saith: All day long, I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

I say, then: Hath God cast away his people? God forbid.—At this present time also, there is a remnant according to the Election of Grace.—

*What, then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for: but the Election hath obtained it; and the rest were blinded**.

2. The point, which I inductively stated as a *presumption*; namely, that *The* IDEALITY *of Election under the Gospel would be the same as the* IDEALITY *of Election under the*

* Rom. ix. 6–26, 30, 31. x. 19–21. xi. 1, 5, 7.

Law: St. Paul here lays down authoritatively, as a *fact.* And so clear is the Apostle's enunciation of this fact, that, as we have already seen, the early ecclesiastical writers, perpetually and unanimously, adduce the passage before us, for the purpose of establishing their own well defined doctrine of *Individual Election into the pale of the visible Church.*

Under a somewhat more scholastic form, I draw out the enunciation in manner following.

The Election of Jacob rather than the Election of Esau, St. Paul determines to import *The Election of Jacob's posterity rather than the Election of Esau's posterity.*

Now the Apostle, as the whole tenor and context of the passage distinctly shew, can only be viewed, as alleging *The Election of the Israelites under the Law* to be the type and exemplar and antecedent of *The Election of Christians under the Gospel:* for his avowed subject is *The Election of the collective Christian Church into the place and privileges of the collective Levitical Church:* whence the Election of the one must, by the very terms of the subject, be homogeneous with the Election of the other.

But *The typical or exemplaric Election of the Israelites under the Law, commencing with Abraham and the successive patriarchs, and finally including the whole body of the posterity of Jacob,* was, as we have seen, *An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Hebrew Church,* or, in other words, *An Ecclesiastical Individual Election.*

Therefore *The antitypical or imitative Election of Christians under the Gospel, commencing with the Apostles, and finally including the whole body of those who profess the faith of Christ, whether converted Jews forming the remnant according to the Election of Grace, or Gentiles constituting*

collectively the Society of the Election, must homogeneously be, *An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Christian Church*, or, in other words, *An Ecclesiastical Individual Election*, also.

Agreeably to this conclusion, we are told; that, in respect of personal holiness, *All are not Israel, which are of Israel:* precisely as, in respect of personal holiness, *All are not faithful Christians, who, in point of privileges and of name, are of the Christian Church of the Election**.

Nevertheless, collectively, just as the whole body of the Israelites were esteemed and denominated *The Chosen People of the Lord:* so, according to the words of Hosea proverbially cited (after a manner not unusual with the sacred writers) in the way of a temporary application, those Gentiles, who once were not God's People, the Lord collectively calls *His People;* and those, who originally were not beloved, are collectively called *The children of the living God.*

II. The IDEALITY of Election under the Gospel being thus specifically explained and set forth by St. Paul, no interpretation of the terms *Election* and *Predestination* and *Elect* and *Chosen*, in whatever passages of the New Testament they occur, can be received, unless it corresponds with this now ascertained IDEALITY: for Scripture must not be interpreted, so as to contradict Scripture.

But, in truth, if we read the New Testament with the present key to its language in our hand: we shall, unless I greatly mistake, find the whole, without any harshness or constraint, of sufficiently easy explication. All will be plain, provided only we bear in our memory the real IDEALITY of Election as the term occurs under the Gospel Dispensation.

* Compare Rom. ii. 28–29.

Evangelical Election, then; if, for the sake of exactness and to prevent all danger of misapprehension, I may be permitted to use some degree of repetition: Evangelical Election, in point of IDEALITY, is *An Election of individuals, whether Jewish or Gentile, into the pale of the visible Christian Church, in order that they may collectively constitute a Holy People unto the Lord, and with God's moral purpose and intention that through Faith and Holiness they should attain everlasting life; but with a moral possibility also, of abusing their privileges, and of thus coming short of the promised reward.*

Hence the term *Elect* is never applied to *some* certain members of the visible Christian Church, as contradistinguished from *other* certain members of the same Church; under the aspect, that *these* are assuredly elected to eternal salvation, while *those* are irrevocably reprobated to eternal damnation.

But the term *Elect* is invariably applied, to *all* who *are* members, as contradistinguished from *all* who are *not* members, of the one visible Church Catholic*.

1. In strict correspondence with this IDEALITY of Election, runs universally the tenor of the compellations, which, in the Apostolic Epistles, are addressed to the various local branches of the one Catholic Church of Christ.

If we could ever fondly imagine that ALL individual members of the early local Churches were infallibly assured

* In Rev. xvii. 14, the term is used mystically: but the IDEALITY remains unaltered. When a large corrupt branch of the Church is mystically described as a body of idolatrous Gentiles (see Rev. xi. 2.); the decorum of the poetical imagery forbids the application of the term *Elect* to them, and restricts it, as of old in the days of ancient Roman Paganism, to those who take part with the Lamb against the heathenish corruptions of the apostates, though in the opposing Churches there may be many personally unholy individuals.

of salvation, the very censure of the Apostles, as well as the too evident drift of Ecclesiastical History, would speedily convince us of our mistake.

Yet, notwithstanding this undeniable circumstance, we never find *one* particular set of Christians addressed as being specially *Elect*, to the exclusion of all *other* Christians, who, together with the unconverted world at large, are thence exhibited as *Reprobates*. But we constantly find, that ALL the members of the local Church addressed are *collectively* saluted, as being, in God's purpose and design, elected, through holiness, to glory.

Clearly, therefore, in the evangelical sense of the word, *Election* by no means denotes *An irreversible Predestination, directly and immediately, to eternal happiness*[*].

2. Nor is the tenor of the apostolic compellations the sole direct proof of the matter before us; in *three* distinct instances as I incline to believe, certainly however in *one* distinct instance, a whole Church corporately is distinguished by the appellation *Elect*.

(1.) *The co-elect Church which is in Babylon saluteth you*[†].

Whether, by *Babylon*, we are here to understand *the literal Babylon* or (as it seems more probable) *the mystical Babylon*, is of no consequence to the present question[‡].

* See Rom. i. 1–7. 1 Corinth. i. 1–3, 26–30. Ephes. i. 1–13. Coloss. i. 1, 2. iii. 12. 1 Thess. i. 1–4. 2 Thess. i. 1. ii. 13, 14. 1 Peter i. 2. ii. 9, 10. To cite these compellations at full length is superfluous: the attentive reader, by referring to them, will readily perceive their palpably universalising tenor so far as professing members of the visible Church Catholic are concerned. He may specially attend to Ephes. i. 1–13.

† 1 Peter v. 13.

‡ That, by *Babylon* in this passage was figuratively meant *Rome* from which (according to the old subscription Ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης)

Sufficient for *our* purpose it is, that, in reference to the previously mentioned elect strangers of the dispersion, the entire Church in Babylon is, we see, styled by St. Peter *The Co-Elect**.

(2.) *The elder to the elect lady and her children*†.

St. John, throughout the whole of his second Epistle, uses language of so large and extensive an import, that, with Dr. Whitby and Lord Barrington, I believe the Apostle to be addressing, no mere single individual Christian matron, but an entire Church, the spiritual parent of an evidently most numerous offspring: an entire Church, which we may very probably deem the Church of Jerusalem, long venerated by antiquity as the lady-mother of all Churches‡. If this per-

St. Peter wrote his first Epistle, seems from Eusebius to have been the opinion of the Primitive Church.

Τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, ἣν καὶ συνταξαι φασιν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης, σημαινει τε τοῦτ' αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα προσειπόντα διὰ τούτων· Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ, καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 15.

* Compare 1 Peter i. 1, 2, with 1 Peter v. 13.

† 2 John 1.

‡ See Whitby's Paraph. in loc. p. 698. Barrington's Miscell. Sacr. p. 51. Dr. Doddridge is unwilling to receive this exposition; and thinks, that the tenth verse, in which mention is made of the elect lady's *house*, seems a strong objection against it. Famil. Expos. in loc. vol. vi. p. 326. I marvel, that so excellent a scripturist as Dr. Doddridge should have hazarded such a remark. The word *House* is, again and again, used to denote *The Church, whether Levitical or Christian*. See Matt. xxiii. 38. Luke xiii. 25. Rom. xvi. 5. 1 Corinth. xvi. 19. 1 Tim. iii. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 20. Heb. iii. 2, 3, 5, 6. x. 21. 1 Peter iv. 17. Hence, analogously to the ordinary language of Scripture, the exhortation, contained in the tenth verse, is simply an apostolic injunction, that the Church of Jerusalem should not receive into ecclesiastical communion, or admit as a member of her spiritual society, any one who should come thither not abiding in the true doctrine of Christ's nature.

suasion be well-founded, we have here a second instance, where the title *Elect* is bestowed corporately upon an entire Church.

(3.) *The children of thine elect sister salute thee**.

Here yet again, in the same Epistle, another (as I believe) figurative matron is introduced, who is equally designated by the title of *Elect*. The ecclesiastical sister, whose salutation to the Church of Jerusalem is thus conveyed by St. John, I conceive to be the Church of Ephesus, where the Apostle had fixed his metropolitan residence, and from the midst of which he was then writing.

3. The same IDEALITY of Election may be easily traced in our Lord's two successive parables of *The Labourers in the Vineyard* and *The Marriage of the King's Son*†.

These parables contain the passages, where the term *Elect* or *Chosen* first occurs: and, in these parables, the *Chosen* or the *Elect* are all those, who so far obey the call of the Gospel as to enter into the pale of the visible Christian Church; while those, who refuse to obey the call, and who indignantly plead the higher antiquity of their supposed prescriptive privileges, are plainly the revolted and stubborn house of the natural Israel.

Accordingly, so far as *personal* conduct is concerned, both good and bad alike are described as having been gathered to the wedding-supper or as having been elected into the Church: but, at the same time, lest bare *Ecclesiastical Election* should be vainly pleaded by the wicked within the pale of the visible Christian Church as it had already been pleaded by the wicked within the pale of the visible Israelitic Church, our Lord distinctly intimates, that, in order to eternal salvation, something more was requisite than mere

* 2 John 13. † Matt. xx. 1–16. xxii. 2–14.

Election into the Church ; I mean, that *Figurative Wedding-Garment without which no man can enter into glory.*

This figurative Wedding-Garment, *some* have, and *others* have not: yet *all* are equally guests, who have accepted the invitation to the wedding-feast; or, in plain language, *all* have equally been elected into the visible Church.

The guests, who have thus accepted the invitation, all remain together, inclosed within the same chamber, and seated at the same table, until the King comes in to inspect his visiters. Then the final and irreversible line of distinction is drawn, between those who have and those who have not wedding-garments, between those who have and those who have not benefitted by the common privilege of Election.

4. Agreeably to this established system of phraseology, we find the *Elect* repeatedly spoken of in such a manner and with such a context, that the term cannot be consistently viewed, as expressing any other persons than those who have been elected into the Church out of the unbelieving world.

(1.) Thus, for instance, speaks our Lord himself.

Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but, for THE ELECTS' SAKE, *those days shall be shortened.—For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders: insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive* THE VERY ELECT*.

(2.) Thus, again, speaks the same Divine Head of the Catholic Church.

If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but, because ye are not of the world, but I HAVE CHOSEN YOU OUT OF THE WORLD, *therefore the world hateth you*†.

* Matt. xxiv. 22, 24. Compare Mark xiii. 20, 22.

† John xv. 19.

(3.) Thus, likewise, speaks his Apostle Paul to Timothy.

I endure all things for THE ELECTS' SAKE, *that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory*.*

(4.) Thus, again, speaks the same Apostle to Titus.

Paul, a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ, ACCORDING TO THE FAITH OF GOD'S ELECT, *to Titus mine own son* AFTER THE COMMON FAITH, *grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour†.*

5. On the same principle, and according to the true IDEALITY of Election as the term occurs in the New Testament, we are, in various texts, either explicitly or virtually, assured: that *The Elect may fall away to eternal ruin.*

(1.) *I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that, by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be* A CAST-AWAY‡.

St. Paul, we see, judged: that he himself *might* be a cast-away; though he had preached to others, and though (in common with those whom he addressed) he repeatedly claimed to be one of the *Elect.*

Now, if the Apostle had been irreversibly chosen and predestinated to *eternal life;* the supposed circumstance of his *ever* being *a cast-away* would be altogether nugatory: for, in fact, it would be a vain and idle supposition of an absolute impossibility.

Nor will any thing be gained by saying: that St. Paul puts the case of his *not* keeping his body under and of his *not* bringing it into subjection; on which hypothesis of a negligent and unholy walk, he *would,* no doubt, be a cast-away.

For, both on the Calvinistic Scheme and on the Arminian

* 2 Tim. ii. 10. † Tit. i. 1, 4.

‡ 1 Corinth. ix. 27.

Scheme, which alike, though on different grounds of CAUSATION, make *the persevering holiness of the Elect* no less a part of God's absolute decree or of God's infallible prevision than *their very Election itself:* the Apostle, in supposing that he *might* cease to keep his body under, would, in truth, no less propound a nugatory impossibility, than in supposing that he *might* be a cast-away from eternal glory.

(2.) *Wherefore the rather, brethren,* GIVE DILIGENCE TO MAKE YOUR CALLING AND ELECTION SURE. *For, if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ**.

St. Peter, when he thus collectively exhorts his christian brethren to *make* their calling and election *sure*, certainly intimates, that they *possessed* no *assured* election to eternal life either in the full calvinistic or in the full arminian sense of the word: for it is impossible to comprehend, how we can *make* that sure, which, either by the invincible decree of God or by the infallible prevision of God, is sure *already*.

Both on the Calvinistic Scheme and on the Arminian Scheme, we might readily conceive the Apostle to urge the brethren, that they should lead a holy life as the only sure evidence to themselves that they were indeed of the number of the Elect. But, on either of those Schemes, it is difficult to comprehend, how he could exhort them to *make* a fixed decree of God or an infallible prevision of God sure by their own diligence: thus virtually intimating, that the accomplishment of such a fixed decree or the completing of such an infallible prevision *might* be frustrated through human neglect or perverseness. God's *purpose* or *intention*, acting morally upon intellectual beings and thence of course bear-

* 2 Peter i. 10.

ing the character of contingency, may, no doubt, be disappointed by man's unhallowed obstinacy: but to say, that the absolute *decree* or the infallible *prevision* of God can be made void and ineffectual, is to assert, so far as I can perceive, a direct contradiction. Nothing, in short, is more difficult than a consistent explanation of the text, according either to the Calvinistic Scheme or the Arminian Scheme: though nothing is more easy than its explanation, according to the primitive doctrine of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election.*

St. Peter considers ALL the brethren whom he addresses, as *Elect* in the true scriptural sense of the word: that is to say, he considers them ALL, as having been elected into the pale of the visible Church, with the purpose on God's part of their obtaining eternal salvation, but with a possibility on their own part of their not obtaining it. Hence we may readily understand, why he exhorts them to give diligence, in order that they might thus *make* their calling and election sure. To the subjects of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election*, the address is strictly and intelligibly appropriate: but, to the subjects either of *Calvinistic Election* or of *Arminian Election*, it is alike inappropriate and unintelligible. The very concinnity, indeed, of its application to the former, makes it one of the strongest evangelical proofs of the scripturality of the doctrine of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election.*

(3.) *It is impossible for those, who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing, they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame**.

* Heb. vi. 4–6.

Notwithstanding the attempts which have been made to explain away the present awful declaration of the inspired writer to the Hebrews, its obvious meaning seems to be this: that not only nominal members of the Christian Church, who were never spiritually of us, or who were never clothed in the mystical wedding-garment of real holiness, might apostatise; but likewise that even persons, who had been actually regenerated, and who had actually both known and loved sincere religion (a description, which exactly corresponds with the character of the *Elect* after their *Effectual Calling* or after their *Genuine Commencement of an infallibly foreseen Godly Life*, in the respective calvinistic and arminian senses of the word *Elect*), might still fall away finally, and might thence render themselves incapable of any further renewal unto repentance.

(4.) *If any man shall take away the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life**.

A person is here spoken of; who is figuratively said to have his name written in the book of life, or, in other words, who is pronounced to be one of the Elect People of God. Yet it is intimated: that God, in his just wrath, may be induced to take away his part out of the book of life or to blot out his name from the roll and catalogue of the Elect.

Now this intimation cannot be made to agree with the character of the Elect, according to that IDEALITY of *Election* in which the Calvinistic Scheme and the Arminian Scheme perfectly concur: the opinion, to wit, that Election itself, whatever may be its impelling CAUSE, is *An irreversible Election of certain individuals to everlasting happiness.*

But it fully agrees with the character of the Elect, ac-

* Rev. xxii. 19.

cording to that IDEALITY of Election which was held by the primitive Christians: the opinion, to wit, that Election is *An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Church, with the purpose indeed of their attaining everlasting happiness, but with a possibility of their not attaining it**.

Therefore, neither *Calvinistic Election* nor *Arminian Election*, but *Ecclesiastical Individual Election*, must be the doctrine really taught in the New Testament.

III. It will be said: that there are places, in which *Election* is inseparably connected with future glory, in which the absolute perpetuity of the Elect in holiness is coupled with the absolute certainty of eternal life, in which the Church of the Election is so described as to compel the definition of its being *The inevitable Church of true spiritual believers exclusively.*

Here I might fairly reply, in general terms: that, if places of this description ought to be understood according to the joint calvinistic and arminian IDEALITY of Election, it is somewhat strange, that no interpretation, constructed upon that basis, should ever seem to have occurred to the Primitive Church, though she received her theology, either immediately or by only one or two descents, from the mouth of the Apostles themselves.

Let us, however, conduct the matter with all possible

* We are brought also to the same result by a remarkable expression of St. Jude, though he uses not the precise word *Elect.*

Of certain persons, who had separated themselves from the Catholic Church, he speaks, as being *twice dead*, or rather as *having twice died*. Jude 12, 19.

Now this phrase inevitably implies: that some, who had really been renewed by the Spirit of Grace, had afterward fallen away to final perdition.

For the circumstance of *having twice died* can only refer: first, to the deadly state of sin, in which all are born; and, secondly, to an ultimate falling away into the same deadly state, after an actual experience of the life-giving influence of the Holy Spirit.

fairness: and, for this purpose, let us inquire; Whether the places, alluded to, bear, of plain and invincible necessity, any such peculiar construction.

1. *All, that the Father giveth to me, shall come to me: and him, that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.—And this is the Father's will which hath sent me: that, of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day**.

This often-adduced passage falls in so exactly with the doctrine of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election;* the doctrine, held by the early Christians, and taught alike both by the Law and by the Gospel: that none, save those whose minds were prepossessed either by the speculations of Augustine and Calvin or by the theory of CAUSATION inculcated by Arminius after Clement of Alexandria, could easily, I think, interpret it otherwise.

(1.) The persons, who, in the present place, are given unto Christ of the Father, and who thence are said to come unto him, are clearly, as all admit, the Elect.

But then, from the whole analogy of Scripture, I contend: that they are the Elect, not in the calvinistic and arminian sense of the word, but in the sense received and delivered by the primitive Christians.

The persons, given unto Christ of the Father, are *Individuals out of all nations, who have been elected and brought into the pale of the visible Church.*

Now they are so elected, with God's merciful purpose of their obtaining eternal salvation, but with a possibility through their own fault of not obtaining it.

Accordingly, our Saviour declares it to be his Father's *will* or *intention* or *design* or *purpose* in thus electing them

* John vi. 37, 39.

into the Church, that he should lose nothing of the whole Collective Body given unto him, but, on the contrary, should at the last day raise it up again unto glory*.

Yet, though such is the *will* or *intention* or *design* or *purpose* of the Father in his decree of Ecclesiastical Individual Election, we know, that it is not always beneficially carried into effect. For, though men are elected into the Church *in order to* salvation, too many members of the Church, through their own sins, *frustrate* God's Grace, and thus *fail* of obtaining everlasting happiness.

(2.) Here a Calvinist is wont to reply: that *This interpretation makes the perverseness of man more powerful than the will of God;* and, consequently, that *It cannot be received*†.

Such an answer is a mere solemn trifling with words.

The will of God, in regard to the spiritual improvement of man, operates *morally*, not *physically:* that is to say, it operates in subjection to those laws of moral government, which the Deity has been pleased to lay down for his intellectual and accountable creatures.

This being the case, unless, according to the plan of Gnostic and Manichèan Fatalism reprobated by Irenèus and disowned by Augustine himself, all human responsibility were destroyed by converting men into mere machines externally wrought upon by *physical* agency: the benevolent

* In the original, as the whole Collective Body of the Election is spoken of, the neuter gender in the singular number is employed.

† This sophism, for I can distinguish it by no better name, was first invented by Augustine: and, from him, has been duly handed down to the more modern Calvinistic School.

Horum si quisquam perit, fallitur Deus: sed nemo eorum perit, quia non fallitur Deus. Horum si quisquam perit, vitio humano vincitur Deus: sed nemo eorum perit, quia nulla re vincitur Deus; electi autem sunt ad regendum cum Christo. August. de Corrept. et Grat. c. 7. Oper. vol. vii. p. 473.

will and purpose of God, operating only as it does by internal *moral* suasion, may doubtless be frustrated by man's obstinate perverseness.

In truth, the calvinistic reply is one of those, which, by proving too much, effectually destroy themselves.

St. Peter assures us: that *The Lord is* NOT WILLING *that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance**.

St. Paul, in like manner, declares: that *God our Saviour* WILL HAVE *all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth*†.

Here, then, on the authority of two inspired Apostles, we have the declared WILL of the Lord: and, from the necessary tenor of that declared WILL, it is *impossible*, according to the purport of the present calvinistic reply, but that *all* must come to repentance, that *none* must perish, that *all* must be saved. For, on the avowed principle of that reply, if a *single* person shall eventually perish through a refusal to repent, the perverseness of such an individual will clearly be more powerful than the will of God. Now we know, that some unholy members of the visible Church, even to say nothing of those who are without its pale, never *do* repent: and, consequently, we know, that some individuals *do* perish. Hence, if there be any validity in the principle of the calvinistic reply, the perverseness of *every* damned soul will have been more powerful than the WILL of God.

2. *My sheep hear my voice and I know them; and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life: and they shall never perish; neither shall any one pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them to me, is greater than all: and no one is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand*‡.

* 2 Peter iii. 9. † 1 Tim. ii. 4. ‡ John x. 27–29.

This second of the often-adduced passages is closely allied to the first.

In the present place, the Sheep of Christ are doubtless his Elect: and their very profession of Christianity, within the pale of the visible Church into which they have been elected, is, in so far forth, a professed following of him.

To all these, so far as the act of donation is concerned, he alike gives eternal life: nor can his gift be cancelled, save, as in the case of *every* gift, by their own voluntary rejection of it. For, as to any external force which might violently pluck them out of his hand and might thus cause them to perish, the weakest of his flock needs not, on that account, to labour under the smallest apprehension: *because*, as he himself distinctly specifies the reason, his Father, who gave them unto him by a decree of Election into his visible Church, is greater than all, and, *therefore*, no one is able violently to pluck them out of his Father's hand.

In this, as in all other parallel places, God's gifts and promises to his Church are, as our seventeenth Article well remarks, to be understood *generally* or *generically*, not *specifically* or *individually*.

3. *We know, that all things work together for good, to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For, whom he foreknew, them also he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and, whom he called, them he also justified: and, whom he justified, them he also glorified**.

The passage now before us is that, which is usually, I believe, deemed the strongest and the least equivocal in

* Rom. viii. 28–30.

favour of the Calvinistic System: and certainly, upon a hasty and superficial survey, many rapid inquirers, who consider not that it is immediately followed by St. Paul's decision that *the* IDEALITY *of Election under the Gospel is identical with the* IDEALITY *of Election under the Law*, may well be staggered by it.

Yet, as we might anticipate, it will prove, I suspect, not a whit more cogent than its two predecessors.

(1.) Of the calvinistic gloss, the professed basis is the last word in the passage: that is to say, its professed basis is the word GLORIFIED.

The whole passage, it is urged, is cumulative or progressive: advancing, step by step, from a first principle to a final result.

It commences with *God's foreknowledge:* and it ends with *Man's glorification.*

If, then, *The Glorification of the Predestinate or the Elect* be the ultimate result of the whole divine process: the Predestinate or the Elect, here spoken of, certainly *cannot* be the *Entire Body of those, who have been brought into the pale of the visible Church;* because it is admitted, that various individuals of *that* Body will, through sin, finally perish, and therefore will *not* be finally glorified.

Consequently, on the other hand, since FINAL GLORIFICATION is the declared characteristic or distinguishing badge of the Elect: it is clear, that the Elect, *thus* characterised or distinguished, *must* be *Certain persons, who, by God's decree of Predestination, have been chosen, through the practical medium of Effectual Calling and Irreversible Justification, to Eternal Glory in the future Kingdom of Heaven.*

(2.) The modern Arminian or Remonstrant, who agrees with the Calvinist as to the IDEALITY of the term *Election* itself; namely, that the term imports *Election to everlasting*

happiness: the modern Arminian will readily answer this argument in favour of the Calvinistic System, by insisting upon that special point of CAUSATION which broadly distinguishes his own System from that of Calvin and Augustine.

With the Calvinist, he will agree in saying: that *God predestinates certain persons to future eternal glory.* But then, in regard to the moving CAUSE of God's decree of Predestination, he places himself directly at issue with the Calvinist.

As its CAUSE, the Calvinist makes Predestination rest, absolutely and unconditionally, upon *God's Supreme Will and Uncontroulable Sovereignty.* But the Arminian makes it rest, as its CAUSE, upon *God's foreknowledge of men's future characters.*

Hence the Arminian will promptly deny, that the present passage affords any legitimate demonstration of the truth of the Calvinistic System. For the Calvinist, he will say, gratuitously assumes from it; that *The Elect are those, whom God has predestinated to eternal glory* PURELY BY THE EXERCISE OF HIS OWN SOVEREIGN WILL AND PLEASURE: whereas the real meaning of it is; that *The Elect are those, whom God has predestinated to eternal glory* BECAUSE HE INFALLIBLY FOREKNEW THEIR FUTURE HOLINESS.

Thus does the Arminian answer the Calvinist. But his answer is altogether ineffectual: for it stands, even by the very passage itself to which he appeals, directly contradicted.

The *Divine Foreknowledge*, of which the Apostle speaks, is not *A* CAUSAL *Foreknowledge of men's future characters*, but simply *That* GENERAL *Foreknowledge of Futurity without which Predestination cannot exist.*

This is evident from what he says of the Predestination involved in it. He does not, with the Arminian, make *Holiness* the CAUSE of Predestination: but, with the Calvinist, he makes *Predestination* the CAUSE of Holiness.

Whom God did foreknow, says he, *them he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son.*

Here, plainly, *A conformity to the image of God's Son*, or, in other words, *Personal Holiness corresponding with the Personal Holiness of Christ*, is exhibited, not as the CAUSE, but as the CONSEQUENCE, of Predestination.

The Calvinist, therefore, is perfectly correct in his interpretation, so far as the groundwork of CAUSATION is concerned: and the reply of the Arminian, who agrees with him in the point of IDEALITY, is thence palpably inefficient and nugatory.

(3.) Matters having been brought to this stage, let us now see: whether a reply, framed upon the true primitive and scriptural IDEA of Election (which IDEA, the present passage, in the hands either of a Calvinist or of an Arminian, would equally be made to set aside), may not easily be excogitated.

That the last word in the passage, the word GLORIFIED to wit, is the key to the whole, will be readily allowed: or rather, to speak more correctly, this is the precise point, which must be specially *insisted upon* for the very purpose of shewing the futility of the calvinistic exposition, and thence by implication the futility of the arminian exposition also, in respect to the IDEALITY of the term *Election*.

The Calvinist and the Arminian, we have seen, alike refer the last word in the passage to *The future eternal Glory of the Elect.*

This reference, however, is erroneous.

If the concluding verb respected *The heavenly Glorification of the Predestinate*, it would, as the sense in *that* case plainly requires, run in the *future* tense.

But, in truth, like all the other verbs throughout the whole cumulative passage, it runs in the *past* tense. For the Apostle does not say; *Those whom he hath justified, them also he*

WILL GLORIFY: but he says; *Those whom he hath justified, them also he* HATH GLORIFIED*.

The glorification, therefore, spoken of, is, with respect to the Predestinate while yet alive upon earth, something *past*, not something *future*.

Hence, let the expression mean what it may, it clearly cannot mean the glorification of the Predestinate in the *next* world *after* their death in *this* world.

Such being the case, since the entire calvinistic gloss rests upon a particular interpretation of the word GLORIFIED, and since that particular interpretation is grammatically inadmissible: the entire gloss itself, so far as I can perceive, falls immediately to the ground.

In short, the whole matter may be thus summed up.

The word GLORIFIED does *not* relate to *The future Glorification of the Election in heaven.* THEREFORE the word affords no proof, that the calvinistic definition of the IDEALITY of Election is its true definition.

Influenced, I suppose, by this plain grammatical reason, the early commentators never imagine a *future* glorification to be intended in the present passage: but they always view the glorification there spoken of, as somewhat *already past* or as somewhat *occurring in this world* during the life-time of the Predestinate.

This is the uniform and harmonious interpretation of Origen and Chrysostom and Ecumenius and Theodoret and Theophylact and Pseudo-Ambrose and Jerome. They pronounce the glorification of the Elect, there mentioned by St. Paul, to consist in a right to participate in the high privileges which Christians, as such, may enjoy, during this present life, within the pale of the Church Catholic: namely,

* Οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε.

the gifts and graces of the Spirit; the adoption into the relation of sonship to their heavenly Father; the gradual transformation from glory to glory, in the course of their acquiring a spiritual similitude to the Son of God*.

That such should be the glorification of ALL the Elect, is the *will* and *purpose* and *design* of the Father: nor is it ever frustrated, save by the resolute perverseness of those who shew themselves unworthy members of the Church into which they have been called and chosen.

4. *Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it: that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish*†.

(1.) To apply such language as this to the whole visible Church, it may be argued, is little short of so much grave mockery: mockery, as we are all aware, not borne out by matter of fact. Therefore it can only relate to the invisible Church of those, who have been irreversibly elected to eternal life. Consequently, the calvinistic doctrine of *Elec-*

* De *glorificatione*, possumus, in præsenti seculo, illud intelligere, quod dicit Apostolus: *nos omnes, revelata facie, gloriam Domini speculantes, eadem imagine transformamur a gloria in gloriam, tanquam a Domini Spiritu.* Orig. Comment. in loc.

Ἐδόξασε, διὰ τῶν χαρισμάτων, διὰ τῆς υἱοθεσίας. Chrysost. in loc.

Ἐδόξασε, διὰ τῶν χαρισμάτων τῆς υἱοθεσίας. Œcum. in. loc.

Ἐδόξασεν, υἱοὺς ὀνομαζόμενος, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου δωρησάμενος χάριν. Theodor. et Theophyl. in loc.

Magnificavit illos, ut similes fiant Filio Dei. Pseudo-Ambros. in loc.

Glorificentur in virtutibus gratiarum. Hieron. Comment. in loc.

For these several authorities, with the exception of the last, I am indebted to Dr. Whitby. See Whitby's Comment. on Rom. viii. 30.

† Ephes. v. 25–27.

tion is, by this passage, circuitously, though surely, established.

Thus may a modern Calvinist argue: and yet his argument will not stand good, even upon his own principles.

According to the avowed tenor of his reasoning, if the apostolic description will not apply to the whole visible Church, on account of the sinfulness of many of her professed members: then neither will it apply to the whole invisible Church of the calvinistically deemed Elect, unless every predestinated member of that supposed Church be entirely free from sin both in thought and in word and in deed; or, as St. Paul speaks, unless every such member be holy and without blemish, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

The description, in short, is palpably inaccurate, whether it be applied to the *Visible Militant Church of the ecclesiastically Elect* or to the supposed *Invisible Militant Church of the calvinistically Elect*. Hence, to adduce the present passage as circuitously establishing the calvinistic doctrine of *Election*, plainly involves an inconsecutiveness of reasoning which cannot be tolerated.

(2.) Most wide, then, from the mark, even on his own argumentative principles, is the modern Calvinist: and I cannot but think, that Augustine, albeit the great original parent of Calvinism, bids much more fairly to give us the true interpretation of the passage.

How, we are prepared to ask, does that eminent Father solve the difficulty? Truly, he solves it after a mode, to which the very difficulty itself conducts us, as it were, by the hand.

The addition of the word GLORIOUS, he tells us, introduced into the present description of the Church, distinctly shews: that, from the Church Militant upon earth, we must look

forward to the Church Triumphant in heaven. *Here*, the Church is largely intermingled with evil: in *this* world, therefore, she corresponds not with the apostolic delineation of her character. But, *hereafter*, when she is made glorious by the acquisition of absolute and entire purity, and when she is thus *really* fitted for presentation to Christ, the case will be altogether changed: in the *next* world, therefore, the apostolic delineation will, to the minutest touch, be perfectly accurate and correct*.

IV. It has now, I trust, been sufficiently shewn: that *The* IDEALITY *of Election under the Gospel is the very same, as the* IDEALITY *of Election under the Law.*

In other words, *Election*, under the Gospel, denotes *The Election of various individuals into the pale of the Visible Church, with God's merciful purpose that through faith and holiness they should attain everlasting life, but with a possibility (since God governs his intelligent creatures on moral principles only) that through their own perverseness they may fail of attaining it.*

* Si confiteantur peccata sua, cum se velint esse Christi corporis membra, quomodo erit illud corpus, id est. *Ecclesia in isto adhuc tempore perfecta*, sicut isti sapiunt, *sine macula et ruga*, cujus membra non mendaciter confitentur se habere peccata? August. cont. duas epist. Pelagian. ad Bonifac. lib. iv. c. 7. Oper. vol. vii. p. 421.

Tunc plena atque perfecta erit Ecclesia, *non habens maculam aut rugam aut aliquid hujusmodi*, quia tunc etiam erit verè *gloriosa*. Cum non tantum ait, *Ut exhiberet sibi Ecclesiam non habentem maculam aut rugam*, set addidit *Gloriosam:* satis significavit, quando erit *sine macula aut ruga aut aliquo hujusmodi*, tunc utique quando *gloriosa*. Non, in tantis malis, in tantis scandalis, in tanta permixtione hominum pessimorum, in tantis opprobriis impiorum, dicendum est, eam esse *gloriosam:* —sed tunc potius *gloriosa* erit, quando fiet quod idem ait Apostolus, *Cum Christus apparuerit vita nostra, tunc et vos apparebitis cum ipso in gloria.* August. de perfect. justit. c. 15. Oper. vol. vii. p. 456.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CAUSATION OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE GOSPEL.

I NOW pass on to an inquiry into the CAUSATION of Election, as such CAUSATION is propounded in the New Testament.

This inquiry will be best conducted, if we prosecute it, in part *negatively*, and in part *positively*.

I. We may commence, then, with prosecuting it *negatively*.

Now, on this point, even *in limine*, we cannot but observe: that the Scheme of CAUSATION, adopted from Clement of Alexandria by the modern Arminians, stands utterly opposed to the whole analogy of the Gospel.

The very principle of the Gospel, which shines forth conspicuously in every page, is *An abasement of all proud notions of human merit, by describing us as sinners before God who at his hand deserve nothing but punishment, and by exhibiting our salvation as a perfectly free gift so far as we are concerned though purchased for us by the alone meritorious death and passion of our Saviour Christ.*

With this principle, however, the notion, first started by the Alexandrian Clement; that *The moving* CAUSE *of Election is God's Foreknowledge of man's future righteousness:* is, so far as I can perceive, utterly and hopelessly irreconcileable.

For, if *God's Foreknowledge of man's future righteousness* be the moving CAUSE of man's Election: then, clearly, man must possess a sufficiency of merit to recommend himself to God.

But such a position contradicts the whole purport and analogy of the Gospel.

Therefore the moving CAUSE of man's Election cannot be *God's Foreknowledge of his future righteousness.*

Accordingly, the sacred writers invariably describe *Holiness*, as being the CONSEQUENCE, not the CAUSE, of man's Election: and thus effectually destroy the vain and presumptuous Scheme of the Arminians.

1. To this purpose, as I have already observed, writes St. Paul to the Romans.

*Whom God did foreknow, them he did also predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son**.

2. To the same purpose, likewise, he writes to the Ephesians.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love†.

3. To the same purpose, again, writes St. Peter to the scattered strangers of Asia.

Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: grace unto you and peace be multiplied‡.

II. Thus, *negatively*, the moving CAUSE of Election, as propounded under the Gospel, cannot be *God's foreknowledge of man's future righteousness.*

We have next to inquire, *positively*, what *is* exhibited under the Gospel, as its real moving or impelling CAUSE.

* Rom. viii. 29. † Ephes. i. 3, 4. ‡ Peter i. 1, 2.

Now this assuredly is said to be *God's Unmerited Grace and Mercy operating according to God's Sovereign Will and Absolute Pleasure.*

1. To such effect, most distinctly and most unequivocally, speaks and reasons St. Paul, respecting those Jews, who, in his days, had embraced Christianity: and thence, of course, what he says of *them*, equally applies to *all others* who had been elected into the Catholic Church of Christ.

Even so then, at this present time also, there is a remnant according to the Election of GRACE. *And, if by* GRACE, *then it is no more of* WORKS: *otherwise,* GRACE *is no more* GRACE. *But, if it be of* WORKS, *then it is no more* GRACE: *otherwise,* WORK *is no more* WORK*.

It is, I think, not easy to find a more clear enunciation than the present. St. Paul declares the moving CAUSE of Election, specifically to be not *Works*, and specifically to be *Grace* alone. Nor does he merely convey this great truth in the form of a naked *declaration*. He also *reasons* upon it in such a manner, as one might well think would have precluded the possibility of any misapprehension. Election is by GRACE. But, if it be by GRACE: then it cannot be by WORKS; because, in the matter of CAUSATION, it is quite clear, that WORKS and GRACE stand inevitably opposed to each other. If *The Grace of God* be the moving CAUSE of Election: then *God's Foreknowledge of man's Works* cannot *also* be its moving CAUSE†.

* Rom. xi. 5, 6.

† *Electi per Electionem Gratiæ.* Unde dicit idem doctor et de Israel: *Reliquiæ per Electionem Gratiæ factæ sunt.* Et, ne forte ante constitutionem mundi ex Operibus prægnitis putarentur electi, secutus est, et adjunxit: *Si autem Gratia, tum non ex Operibus; alioquin, Gratia jam non est Gratia.* August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. v. c. 4. Oper. vol. vii. p. 374.

2. In a similar manner, and in perfect accordance with the last-cited passage, St. Paul makes a parallel declaration to Timothy respecting the whole Body of the Elect.

God hath called us with an holy calling, NOT ACCORDING TO OUR WORKS, *but* ACCORDING TO HIS OWN PURPOSE AND GRACE *which was given in Christ Jesus before the world began**.

3. He again lays down the same System of CAUSATION at the commencement of his Epistle to the Ephesians.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, ACCORDING TO THE GOOD PLEASURE OF HIS WILL, *to the praise of* THE GLORY OF HIS GRACE *wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved: in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,* ACCORDING TO THE RICHES OF HIS GRACE; *wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us* THE MYSTERY OF HIS WILL, ACCORDING TO HIS GOOD PLEASURE WHICH HE HATH PURPOSED IN HIMSELF: *that, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him: in whom also we have obtained an inheritance,* BEING PREDESTINATED ACCORDING TO THE PURPOSE OF HIM WHO WORKETH ALL THINGS AFTER THE COUNSEL OF HIS OWN WILL†.

The Apostle, with a singular copiousness of repetition, seems here to pile words upon words and to heap declarations upon declarations, for the purpose of precluding all possibility of misapprehension. Again and again he pro-

* 2 Tim. i. 9. † Ephes. i. 3–11.

nounces, that *The good pleasure of God's Will according to the riches of his Grace* is the real and only moving CAUSE of man's Election or Predestination.

4. Lastly, St. Paul, by arguing at considerable length on the subject and by formally meeting that very objection which evidently produced the unscriptural Scheme of CAUSATION first contrived by Clement of Alexandria, may justly be viewed as for ever setting at rest, so far at least as inspired testimony is concerned, the question now before us.

Speaking of the future destinies of the respective descendants of Jacob and Esau, as the type and exemplar of Election and Reprobation under the Gospel, the Apostle declares: that, *In respect to the point of* CAUSATION, *those destinies depended neither upon* GOOD *nor upon* EVIL; but, on the contrary, that *The whole divine arrangement, by which the Israelites were elected into the pale of the Levitical Church while the Edomites were rejected from becoming members of it, was settled, in order that* THE PURPOSE OF GOD ACCORDING TO ELECTION MIGHT STAND, NOT OF WORKS, BUT OF HIM THAT CALLETH*.

This declaration, as might have been anticipated, forthwith brings up an objection against God's justice.

What shall we say, then? Is there injustice with God†?

The objection is briefly stated: and then is briefly set aside, rather dogmatically than argumentatively, with the pious exclamation; *God forbid*‡. Yet still, though the objection is summarily set aside as inadmissible, the difference, which is made between the descendants of the two brothers, St. Paul firmly perseveres in referring, not to any CAUSAL *Foreknowledge of their respective future actions*, but purely to *God's Sovereign Will and Absolute Pleasure.*

He saith to Moses; I will have mercy on whom I will have

* Rom. ix. 11. † Rom. ix. 14. ‡ Rom. ix. 14.

*mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is, not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.—Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy; and whom he will he hardeneth**.

Feeling, however, that such a reply might be deemed no specific answer to the objection, he again introduces his opponent as still persisting in the same line of controversial argument.

Thou wilt say, then, unto me: Why doth he yet find fault; for who hath resisted HIS WILL† ?

Here the matter is brought at once to a direct issue.

You refer, says the objector, *the whole difference that has been made between Jacob and Esau, in the persons of their descendants, to* GOD'S SOVEREIGN WILL AND PLEASURE. *But who is there, that either does or can resist* THE SUPREME WILL OF THE DEITY ? *We know God to be omnipotent. We require not to be told, that all creatures must bend to* HIS SOVEREIGN WILL. *But how does this reference to* THE OMNIPOTENCY OF GOD'S WILL *settle the present difficult question of* GOD'S JUSTICE ?

Now it is evident: that, if, as the solution of Clement and the Arminians avowedly contends, Scriptural Election and Scriptural Reprobation were CAUSALLY founded upon *God's Foreknowledge of the future holiness or the future unholiness of certain individuals;* no such objection, as that which is here argumentatively propounded by the Apostle, could possibly have lain against the arrangement: or, if, through pure ignorance or misapprehension of the moving CAUSE, such an objection *had* been made or *might* be made to the scriptural doctrine of *Election and Reprobation;* the Apostle would readily and easily have answered it, by the very

* Rom. ix. 15, 16, 18. † Rom. ix. 19.

simple and obvious process of merely unfolding, what, according to Clement and the Arminians, is the true moving CAUSE of God's decree of Predestination; for it is quite clear, that no plea of injustice could lie against the declared arrangement, if declared it *had* been, that God elects some BECAUSE *he foresees their future holiness*, and that God rejects others BECAUSE *he foresees their future unholiness.*

But, instead of accounting for Election on the ground, as the Pseudo-Ambrose speaks, of *God's electing those who he foreknew would be devoted to him;* and instead of accounting for Reprobation on the parallel ground of *God's rejecting those who he foreknew would be the reverse of being devoted to him:* St. Paul warmly rebukes the presumption of the objector; and contents himself with resolving the whole impelling CAUSE of God's acts of Election and Rejection into *God's bare exercise of his Supreme Will* or into *God's bare exercise of his Absolute Sovereignty.*

Nay but, O man, who art thou, that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it: Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour ?*

Thus does the wise Apostle shut up the question. He answers not the objection argumentatively: he sets it not at rest by any such Scheme, as that devised by Clement and advocated by the Arminians. But, while he resolves the whole matter into *God's Sovereign Pleasure:* he indignantly and authoritatively denies, that any injustice can be ascribed to a God of perfect justice.

III. When such evidence, according to the plain and conventional acceptation of language, directly meets us in the face, I cannot but come to the conclusion: that, *Under*

* Rom. ix. 20, 21.

the Gospel as well as under the Law, the impelling CAUSE *of God's Predestination is, not God's Foreknowledge of man's future fitness or unfitness, but God's Supreme Will and Absolute Sovereign Pleasure.*

In truth, as I have already observed, this conclusion inevitably follows from the IDEALITY of Election and Reprobation as set forth both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament.

Election being, in point of IDEALITY, *An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Church;* and Reprobation, in point of IDEALITY, being, conversely, *A Rejection of certain individuals from being members of the visible Church*: the clear result is, that *such* an Election and *such* a Reprobation can only, in the very nature and necessity of things, rest CAUSALLY upon *God's Supreme Will and Pleasure.*

For, if Election into the Church CAUSALLY rested, as Clement of Alexandria speaks, upon *God's Foreknowledge of man's righteousness:* it is obvious, that the existence, or at least the final continuance, of an *unrighteous* person, within the pale of the visible Church, would be an actual impossibility; because the very supposition of such an occurrence, on the CAUSAL principle advocated by Clement, involves a direct contradiction in terms. We shall, in that case, be compelled to admit: that God elects a permanently and incorrigibly *unrighteous* person from a foreknowledge of that *unrighteous* person's *righteousness.*

Thus we perceive; that the strictly primitive doctrine of *Election*, in point both of IDEALITY and of CAUSATION, is the precise doctrine authoritatively delivered both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament: and thus we practically see the value of Tertullian's canon; *Whatever is first, is true; whatever is later, is adulterate.*

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, RESPECTING ELECTION, INVESTIGATED NEGATIVELY.

We have now attained to what I cannot but deem a moral certainty in regard to the true scriptural doctrine of *Election:* for we have found the precise doctrine, which was held by the strictly Primitive Church, to be distinctly set forth also both under the law and under the Gospel.

Hence we have a triple testimony, a testimony at once authoritative and interpretative, that the view, which has been taken of the doctrine of *Election*, is the alone correct view: and, as the wise man says, *a threefold cord is not quickly broken**.

Here, then, we might fairly stop in our inquiry: for the result, to which we have now been brought, cannot in the slightest degree be affected by the decision of any Church of the present day, either favourable or unfavourable.

Discrepance, on the part of such Church, may prove *itself* to have erred: but agreement, on its part, cannot make essential truth to be *more* than truth.

So far, therefore, as the *real* subject of our inquiry is concerned, the Theological System of the Church of England, having no direct connection with it, cannot be deemed, *argumentatively*, of any special moment or importance.

Yet, though an examination of the System of that Church be, in absolute strictness of *ratiocination*, irrelevant to our

* Eccles. iv. 12.

present subject, neither adding anything to nor detracting anything from the historical evidence in regard to the main question: still, as dutiful and attached members of a venerable Communion, which, save in our evil days of schism and faction, has ever been esteemed a principal bulwark of sound Christianity; we may be allowed, even though *in argument* superfluously, to inquire, *What precise Scheme has been adopted by the Reformed Church of England.*

Following the general plan of the present Work, as the most advantageous for a satisfactory development of the truth: I shall begin, then, with investigating, NEGATIVELY, *What doctrine, on the topic of Election, the Church of England* DOES NOT *hold.*

I. With modern Calvinists, it is not uncommon to claim the Anglican Church as their own, *de jure*, if not *de facto:* and, so far as I know, the proof of the justice of their claim they rest altogether upon the Seventeenth Article of that Church.

Yet there are various important matters, which certainly seem to render their claim wholly inadmissible. These matters shall successively be considered in their order.

1. It is worthy of note, that, even at the very commencement of an inquiry into the justice of this claim, chronology itself presents no trifling obstacle to its admission.

According to Strype, Cranmer, in the year 1551, received an order to prepare a Book of Articles. This Book, when compiled, was, in the same year 1551, communicated to the Bishops. In the May of the year 1552, the Articles, thus drawn up, were laid before the Privy Council. And, in the following September, they were revised, were arranged in a different order, received titles which had not been previously affixed to them, and were moreover considerably augmented. Thus improved, they were finally returned to

the Privy Council in November: and, in the early part of the year 1553, they were ratified and published*.

Now Calvin's first public controversy, on the doctrine of *Predestination*, did not commence until the close of the year 1551: and his earliest Tract upon that subject, entitled *De Æterna Dei Prædestinatione*, was not published, even at Geneva and in Switzerland, until the January of the year 1552†.

Therefore, on mere chronological grounds, it is evident: that the Seventeenth Article, as originally drawn up and communicated to the Bishops in the year 1551, can, by no possibility, have been borrowed from Calvin.

Neither can it, with any shew of probability, be urged: that, since Calvin's earliest Tract on the subject of Predestination was published in the January of the year 1552, and since in the course of that same year 1552 the English Articles were revised and augmented; the Seventeenth Article might, with reference to Calvin's Tract, have been moulded into the form in which it was first ratified at the beginning of the year 1553.

For, though Calvin had written two letters to Cranmer on the subject of a General Protestant Congress for the settlement of doctrine, which are without date, but which Beza ascribes to the year 1551: yet so little was the weight

* Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, p. 272. For this authority, and for the succeeding authorities which bear on the present part of my subject, I am indebted to the very valuable Bampton Lectures of Archbishop Laurence.

† The controversy commenced with the opposition of Jerome Bolsec, which led him, on the sixteenth of October in the year 1551, to declaim openly in the full congregation, after the conclusion of divine worship, against the doctrine of absolute decrees. For this misdemeanour he was banished on the twenty-second of December in the same year. Beza in vit. Calvin. A. D. 1551, 1552. Calvin. Opusc. p. 949. edit. 1576.

which he carried with the early English Reformers, that, even in the subsequent reign of Mary, he admitted that they attached but small credit to his name or importance to his opinion. Discord existed, among the anglican exiles, on the subject of the Liturgy. Calvin gave them some very good advice upon the subject: but he despairingly added; *I, however, vainly address my admonitions to persons, who perhaps do not attribute to me sufficient importance, that they should design to receive any counsel which proceeds from such an author**.

2. Still it may be said: that, if the Seventeenth Article was not absolutely composed in deference to the authority of the individual Calvin himself, it faithfully, nevertheless, exhibits that Scheme of Doctrine which usually bears the name of *Calvinism:* and, whether in its actual pedigree it literally sprang from Calvin or from Augustine, cannot be a matter of much intrinsic consequence, inasmuch as, in either case, the result will be precisely the same.

I will readily admit the fairness of this reply, provided the point, on which it professedly rests, can be established. But *that* I much doubt. The *real* parent of the Seventeenth Article, if I may so speak, was neither Calvin nor Augustine, but Melancthon. To judge, therefore, whether that

* Calvin. Epist. p. 100, 101. Sed ego frustra ad eos sermonem converto, qui forte non tantum mihi tribuunt, ut consilium a tali auctore profectum admittere dignentur. Calvin. Epist. p. 158. So little known in England was the fame of Calvin about this period, that one of his Works was translated and published in the year 1549, under the following title: *Of the Life and Conversation of a Christian Man; a right godly Treatise, written in the Latin Tongue by Master John Calvin, a man of right excellent learning and of no less conversation.* Ames's Typographical Antiquities, p. 620. On this it is remarked by Archbishop Laurence: *Does not this encomium prove, that his name, in consequence, if not of its obscurity, at least of its little celebrity, stood in need of some commendation?* Bampt. Lect. p. 243.

Article be designedly calvinistic or augustinian, we must obviously inquire: *What were the sentiments of Melancthon at the time, when, on the subject of Predestination, he was consulted by Cranmer its actual and immediate author.*

This eminent divine was honoured with repeated invitations into England during the reigns both of Henry and of Edward*: and, as he was thus evidently deemed by our early Reformers the best and safest continental authority; so, in the year 1548, when Cranmer's mind was deeply occupied with doctrinal subjects and immediately before he received formal directions to draw up a Book of Articles, he was consulted by that Prelate, through the medium of the younger Justus Jonas then resident with the Archbishop in England, on *some* point connected with the compilation of a Public Creed. *What* that point was, is abundantly clear from the reply of Melancthon.

Letters have been brought to me from the younger Jonas, in which he mentions a discourse of yours, concerning a question in itself by no means obscure, but yet a question which has terribly agitated the Church and will continue still worse to agitate it because the governors seek not the true remedies for so great a matter.—A multifold variety of explications both have been, and are still, excogitated; merely because simple and sincere Antiquity is neglected.—I beg, therefore, that you would deliberate with good and really learned men, what great need there is of caution and moderation in formally expressing any decision.—At the commencement of our Reformation, the Stoical Disputations among our people concerning Fate were too horrible: and they did much mis-

* Mælanc. Epist. p. 717, 732, 915, 930. Seckendorf. Hist. Luther. lib. iii. § 66. add. 1. Strype's Eccles. Memor. vol. ii. p. 401.

chief to discipline. Hence I request, that you would think well respecting any such formula of doctrine.*

Melancthon, when the Reformation began in Germany, had, in common with others, taken up the harsh dogma of *Absolute Predestinarian Fatalism.* But, so early as the year 1527, he appears to have abandoned it: and, after the diet of Augsburg in the year 1530, it was no more heard of†. At all events, in the year 1529, he had not only abandoned, but even strongly reprehended, that doctrine. This is a matter of certainty: because, in a letter to Stathmio written shortly before his death, he states the circumstance as having occurred thirty years previously‡. Accordingly, though he had at first introduced the tenet into his *Loci Theologici*, he afterward, in the edition of the year 1535, wholly expunged it§: and, thenceforward, in the very strongest terms, perpetually expressed his rooted aversion‖.

* Adferuntur filii Jonæ literæ, in quibus mihi sermonem quendam tuum narrat de quæstione non obscura, sed quæ duriter concussit Ecclesiam, et concutiet durius, quia gubernatores illi tantæ rei non quærunt vera remedia.—Vides multiplices explicationes, et olim excogitatas esse, et nunc excogitari. *quia negligitur simplex et sincera Vetustas.*—Illud autem te oro, ut deliberes cum viris bonis ac verè doctis, et quod statuendum et qua moderatione initio in dicendo opus sit.—*Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ Disputationes apud nostros de Fato, et disciplinæ nocuerunt.* Quare te rogo, ut de tali aliqua formula doctrinæ cogites. Melanc. Epist. lib. iii. epist. 44.

† Laurence's Bampton Lect. p. 256.

‡ Apud Homerum fortissimus bellator optat concordiam his verbis: Ὢ ἔρις ἔκτε θεῶν ἐκτ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο. Quanto magis me senem et infirmum optare pacem consentaneum est. Ante annos triginta, non studio contentionis, sed propter gloriam Dei, et propter disciplinam, reprehendi *Stoica Paradoxa de Necessitate*, quia et contra Deum contumeliosa sunt, et nocent moribus. Nunc mihi bellum inferunt *Stoicorum phalanges.* Epist. Lib. Lond. p. 407. The date of this letter is March 20, 1559.

§ Laurence's Bamp. Lect. p. 258.

‖ Palam etiam rejicio et detestor *Stoicos et Manichæos furores*, qui af-

Now it will be recollected, that, in the year 1548, and consequently long *after* Melancthon had renounced the dogma of *Absolute Predestinarian Fatalism*, he was consulted by Cranmer relative to *some* point connected with the compilation of a Public Creed. *What* that point was, is abundantly determined, as we have seen, by the answer of Melancthon. Clearly it was no other, than the best and most scriptural mode of fixing upon *A public symbolical definition of the doctrine of Predestination for the use of the Reformed Church of England.*

Such being the case, Melancthon, having long renounced the dogma of *Predestinarian Fatalism*, certainly *could not* recommend to Cranmer any System of *that* description.

Accordingly, as we have seen, while he laments the mischief which accrued to the early German Reformation from what he calls *Stoical Disputations concerning Fate:* he strongly dehorts the Archbishop from introducing any such

firmant omnia necessario fieri, bonas et malas actiones, de quibus omitto hic longiores disputationes. Tantum oro juniores, ut fugiant has monstrosas opiniones, quæ sunt contumeliosæ contra Deum et perniciosæ moribus. Melanc. Oper. vol. i. p. 370.

Alii fingunt Deum, sedere in coelo, et scribere fatales leges, quasi in tabulis Parcarum, secundum quas velit distribuere virtutes et vitia, sicut Stoici de Fato suo sentiebant.—Sed nos, *abjectis his deliramentis humanæ caliginis*, referamus oculos et mentem ad testimonia de Deo proposita.—Removeamus igitur a Paulo *Stoicas Disputationes*, quæ fidem et invocationem evertunt. Melanc. Loc. Theolog. de Prædest.

Non sum Stoicus: et aliquanto fortius *dimico cum Zenonis familia de Fato*, quam nostri bellatores ad Danubium et ad Albim præliati sunt. Melanc. Epist. p. 370.

Removeamus igitur a Deo *Stoicam Torvitatem:* et verè nos ab eo diligi statuamus. Melanc. Epist. p. 557.

At *Stoicæ illæ Disputationes execrandæ sunt*, quas asserunt aliqui; disputantes, Omnia peccata paria esse; Electos semper retinere Spiritum Sanctum, etiam cum lapsus atroces admittunt. Melanc. Loc. Theol. p. 126.

speculations into those authorised documents of the Anglican Church, which were then about to be prepared; advising him rather, for sound information on the subject, to advert to that simple and sincere Antiquity, which by vain modern innovators had been grievously too much neglected.

Nor can it be said: that, if Melancthon rejected the Absoluteness of Stoical or Manichèan Fatalism, he retained those views of Election and Predestination, which, with an admission of the freedom of the human will, were held by Augustine. For, in truth, he, in so many words, reprobates, to the great annoyance of Calvin (as Beza remarks), Calvinism *itself*, as being precisely the System which he renounced under the aspect of *Stoical or Manichèan Necessity:* styling Calvin *the Zeno of Geneva*, and reprobating his unhallowed violence toward his opponent Bolsec*.

Under such circumstances, I cannot but deem it impossible, that Cranmer, acting by the advice of Melancthon, could ever have designedly framed the Seventeenth Article of the English Church on the principles of Calvin and Augustine.

3. With this conclusion agrees the very texture of the Article itself.

In the Calvinistic System, the IDEA of Election is *An irre-*

* Pungebant ista (scil. Genevenses Stoicum Fatum invehentes notare) gravissimè, sicuti par erat, illius animum, et eo quidem acerbius, quod ea fuit interdum per id tempus erroris efficacia, ut publica etiam auctoritate alicubi obstructum os veritati videretur. Bez. Vit. Calvin. A. D. 1552.

Lelius mihi scribit, tanta esse Genevæ certamina *de Stoica Necessitate*, ut carceri inclusus sit *quidam a Zenone dissentiens*. O rem miseram! Doctrina salutaris obscuratur peregrinis disputationibus. Melanc. Epist. p. 396.

Ac vide sæculi furores, certamina Allobrogica *de Stoica Necessitate* tanta sunt, ut carceri inclusus sit quidam, qui *a Zenone dissentit*. Melanc. Epist. p. 923.

versible Election of certain individuals to eternal life: while its CAUSE is *The Absolute Will and Pleasure of the Deity.*

If, then, the Seventeenth Article were designedly calvinistic, and if the IDEA of Election inculcated by it were that advocated by the School of Geneva: we may be sure, that the CAUSE, assigned in the Calvinistic System, would not be omitted.

But, in point of fact, the Article assigns no CAUSE whatever of Predestination.

Hence, even if it could be shewn to inculcate the calvinistic IDEA of Election itself: that IDEA being identical with the IDEA, inculcated by the System, afterward denominated *Arminianism*, and widely fashionable at the time of the commencement of the Reformation*; no valid evidence would be afforded by the texture of the Article, that it is *intentionally* calvinistic. On such an hypothesis, *wanting*,

* This was the Scheme of Doctrine advocated by Thomas Aquinas and Bernard de Bustis, who state it with abundance of distinctness.

Thomæ Aquinatis de Prædestinatione sententia talis fuit: *Deum, cum universa videat antequam fiant, hominem prædestinare, tum scilicet, cum per sapientiam viderit qualis futurus sit.* Zuing. Oper. vol. i. p. 367.

Magister, in i. dist. 40, dicit: *Prædestinatio est quædam comparatio, qua Deus elegit, quos voluit, ante mundi constitutionem.* Sed dicas: *Ergo est personarum acceptor.* Respondeo, quod non sequitur: nam ipse Deus ex hoc non acceptat personas, sed merita; et damnat demerita. Et ideo non omnes prædestinavit, quia prævidit quosdam in peccata duraturos. Unde illos tantum prædestinavit, quos rectè finituros cognovit. Bern. de Bust. Homil. vol. ii. p. 198.

Such, says Archbishop Laurence, was the popular Creed not long before the Reformation. That, at the period immediately preceding it and at its very commencement, the doctrine of the Church remained the same, is evident from the controversy of Fevre D'Etaples, who was particularly patronised by Margaret Queen of Navarre, and who was persecuted for supposed heresy by the Sorbonne of Paris. Bampt. Lect. p. 398.

as it does, all definition of the CAUSE, it might be claimed by an Arminian just as plausibly as by a Calvinist.

Of this deficiency, the Calvinising Party, which, toward the end of the reign of Elizabeth and the beginning of the reign of her successor James, had great weight and influence in the Church of England, were perfectly aware: and thence, for the furtherance of their own System, laboured hard to repair it.

Accordingly, in the year 1595, Dr. Whitaker, the very able leader of the Calvinistic Party at Cambridge, clearly enough perceiving the deficiency of the Seventeenth Article of the years 1552 and 1562, drew up, as an explanation of it, those nine subsidiary Articles, which, from the circumstance of their having been composed at the archiepiscopal palace, are usually styled *The Lambeth Articles*, and which, no doubt, most abundantly supplied that deficiency: for, of these nine Articles, the four first were couched in the following terms; which explicitly define both the IDEA and the CAUSE of Election, to be the very IDEA and the very CAUSE propounded in the Calvinistic System.

From eternity, God predestinated some to life, and reprobated others to death.

Of Predestination to life, the moving or efficient CAUSE *is, not A Prevision of Faith or of Perseverance or of Good Works or of Any Thing Inherent in predestinated persons, but The Sole Will of the Good Pleasure of God.*

The number of the predestinated is predefined and certain: which number can be neither increased nor diminished.

They, who are not predestinated to salvation, will necessarily be condemned on account of their own sins.*

* The nine Lambeth Articles run, as follows:

1. Deus, ab æterno, prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam, quosdam reprobavit ad mortem.

2. Causa movens aut efficiens, prædestinationis ad vitam, non est

These arbitrary and intemperate Articles were, however, rejected: though, both in the reign of Elizabeth and in the reign of James, an attempt was made to engraft them, as the authoritative explanation of the Seventeenth Article, upon the Articles of the Church of England. But, still, even the very attempt abundantly shews: that, *By the Calvinists of that day, the Seventeenth Article was thought to be not, either in point of* IDEALITY *or in point of* CAUSATION, *sufficiently explicit for their purpose**.

prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ aut bonorum operum aut ullius rei quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

3. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est numerus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necessario propter peccata sua damnabuntur.

5. Vera, viva, et justificans, fides, et Spiritus Dei justificantis, non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit, in Electis, aut finaliter aut totaliter.

6. Homo verè fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est, plerophoria fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum, et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur, universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si velint.

8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum, nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit: et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre, ut veniant ad Filium.

9. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis servari.

* The seeds of Calvinism had been sown at Cambridge by Cartwright, while he held the Margaret Professorship of Divinity: and their growth was afterward so greatly fostered by Whitaker who became Regius Professor in the year 1580, that the Heads of Houses concurred in censuring an anticalvinistic *Concio ad Clerum* preached by Barret of Caius College. Yet, nevertheless, Baro, whose principles, like those of Barret, were anticalvinistic, had previously been Margaret Professor about the year 1571: and, without any censure or interruption, had continued for many years to deliver Theological Lectures composed in accordance with his own doctrinal sentiments. The great

4. Thus, if I mistake not, we have no valid evidence, that the Theological System of Calvin is the Theological System of the Reformed Church of England.

II. The IDEALITY of Election being precisely the same both in the Arminian Scheme and in the Calvinistic Scheme, it is easy to conceive, that the Arminians, no less than the Calvinists, would claim the Church of England as an ally. Chronology, indeed, would effectually prevent any allegation, that the Seventeenth Article had been borrowed from Arminius *himself:* but still no small weight would be given to the tenets of that Divine, if a case could be decently made out, that the Anglican Church, adopting the fashionable System of Theology which prevailed down to the commencement of the Reformation, had proleptically symbolised with him in doctrine.

I think it probable, that some such notion had occurred to Arminius: for his statement of the doctrine of *Predestination* bears so strong a *verbal* resemblance to the statement of the same doctrine in the Seventeenth Article, that it is difficult to avoid suspecting the intentional mutuation of the one from the other.

Predestination, says he, is *The decree of the Good Pleasure of God in Christ, by which, within himself, he hath, from all eternity, determined, to justify, and to adopt, and to gift with eternal life to the praise of his glorious Grace, those faithful individuals, whom he hath decreed to endow with faith.*

The special kind of Predestination we define to be That

influence and reputation of Whitaker was that, which, for a season, rendered the Calvinistic Scheme so popular at Cambridge. With respect to our Articles, the Calvinists of that time were so little satisfied with them, that they actually complained of *their speaking very dangerously of falling from grace:* an alleged error, which, said they, *is to be reformed.*

decree which the Scripture calls The Purpose and Counsel of the Will of God: *that is to say, not* The Legal Decree, according to which it is said, The man, that doeth these things, shall live in them; *but* The Evangelical Decree, the terms of which are, This is the will of God, that every one, who seeth the Son and believeth in him, shall have eternal life. *Therefore this decree is peremptory and irrevocable: because the last revelation of the whole counsel of God, concerning our salvation, is contained in the Gospel.*

The CAUSE *of Predestination is* God himself, according to his Good Pleasure or the Benevolent Affection of his Will, by which being moved, in himself and with himself, he has made that decree. *This Good Pleasure not only excludes all cause, which he might take from man himself, or which he might be feigned to take: but it also throws aside whatever there was in man or from man, which might justly move God lest he should make that gracious decree.*

We pronounce Jesus Christ, who is the Mediator between God and man, to be, of that decree, the foundation.—He has been by God constituted the head of all those, who, through divine Predestination, are about to receive the communion of all spiritual blessings.

To that decree we ascribe eternity: because, in time, he hath done nothing, which, from all eternity, he did not decree to do. For known unto the Lord our God are all his works from eternity; and he chose us in Christ, before the foundations of the world were laid: otherwise, God would be charged with mutability.—

The end of Predestination is the praise of the glorious Grace of God: for, since The Grace or the Free Love of God in Christ *is the* CAUSE *of Predestination, it is just, that to him should accrue all the glory of that act.*

But, as the Apostle speaks, this decree of Predestination is

according to Election: and, inasmuch as Election necessarily infers Reprobation, this Reprobation, which is also called Abjection *and* Dooming to damnation *and* Constitution to wrath, *is thence, in the way of contrariety, opposed to Predestination.*

Now that same Reprobation, by the law of contraries, we define to be The decree of Wrath or Severe Pleasure of God, by which, from all eternity, he has determined to condemn to eternal death, for the purpose of declaring his wrath and power, those unbelievers, as placed out of union with Christ, who, by their own fault and by the just judgment of God, are not about to believe.—

Of this doctrine, thus delivered from Scripture, great is the use.

It serves, at once: to build up glory to the Grace of God; to comfort afflicted consciences; and to terrify the wicked and destroy the false security of the ungodly.

The Grace of God it builds up: since, to the mercy of God alone, it ascribes the whole praise, both of our calling and of our justification and of our adoption and of our glorification, entirely separated from all strength and works and merit of our own.

It comforts consciences struggling with temptation: since it assures them of the gracious benevolence of God in Christ, decreed to them from eternity, and granted to them in time, and about to endure for ever; and since it shews, that that benevolence stands firm, not from works, but from him that calleth.

And it avails to terrify the wicked: because it teaches, that the decree of God, to adjudge to eternal destruction those who believe not and obey not the truth but who are obedient unto a lie, is irrevocable.

Finally, therefore, this doctrine ought to resound, not only in private houses and in schools, but also among the assem-

*blages of the Saints in the church of God: yet with the observance of this caution, that nothing be taught respecting it which is not contained in Scripture, that it be propounded in the mode usual throughout Scripture, and that it be referred to that same end which Scripture in delivering it proposes**.

1. The English Church, in her Seventeenth Article, is

* Prædestinatio itaque, ad rem quod attinet ipsam, est decretum beneplaciti Dei in Christo, quo apud se ab æterno statuit fideles, quos fide donare decrevit, justificare, adoptare, et vita æterna donare, ad laudem gloriosæ gratiæ suæ.

Genus Prædestinationis decretum ponimus, quod προθεσιν et βουλην του θελήματος Θεου Scriptura appellat: et decretum non legale, secundum quod dicitur, *Qui fecerit ea, homo vivet in illis;* sed evangelicum, cujus hic est sermo, *Hæc est voluntas Dei, ut omnis, qui videt Filium et credit in illum, habeat vitam æternam.* Et propterea decretum hoc est peremptorium et irrevocabile, quia Evangelio continetur totius consilii Dei de salute nostra extrema patefactio.

Causa est Deus, secundum beneplacitum seu benevolum affectum voluntatis suæ, quo, motus in se et apud se, decretum illud fecit. Hoc beneplacitum non modo excludit omnem causam, quam ab homine sumere fingi potuit: verum etiam amolitur quicquid in homine vel ab homine erat, quod Deum justè permovere poterat, ne decretum illud gratiosum faceret.

Decreti illius fundamentum ponimus Jesum Christum, mediatorem Dei et hominum.—Hic etiam caput constitutus est a Deo omnium illorum, qui istorum bonorum communionem sunt divina Prædestinatione accepturi.

Decreto isti æternitatem tribuimus, quia Deus nihil in tempore facit, quod ab æterno facere non decreverit: *nota enim sunt Domino Deo nostro omnia opera sua ab ævo.* Et elegit nos in Christo, antequam jacerentur fundamenta mundi: secus, Deo mutatio impingitur.—

Finis Prædestinationis est laus gloriosæ gratiæ Dei: quum enim gratia seu gratuitus Dei amor in Christo Prædestinationis causa sit, æquum est, ut illi eidem omnis istius actus gloria cedat.

Hoc autem Prædestinationis decretum est *secundum Electionem*, ut inquit Apostolus, quæ Electio cum necessario inferat Reprobationem, hinc Prædestinationi contraria opponitur Reprobatio, quæ etiam *Abjectio* dicitur, *Descriptio ad damnationem*, et *Constitutio ad iram.*

Illam autem, ex lege contrariorum, definimus *Decretum iræ seu se-*

silent respecting the CAUSE of Predestination. But Arminius had to deal with a high calvinistic party, which was vehemently adverse to him. Hence, though retaining his own sentiments, he *apparently* concedes the very distinction which lies at the bottom between Calvinism and Arminianism. In this particular, I fear we must praise his ingenuity, rather than his ingenuousness: for the apparent concession is a mere using of calvinistic *phraseology* in a non-calvinistic *sense*.

When he speaks of the CAUSE of Predestination being *God himself according to the motion of his Good Pleasure in himself and with himself; which Good Pleasure excludes whatever there was in man or from man to induce him either to make or not to make that gracious decree:* we might well imagine, that we heard Calvin himself theologising from his doctrinal chair at Geneva. Nevertheless, by *The Good*

veræ voluntatis Dei, qua ab æterno statuit infideles, qui culpa sua et justo Dei judicio crediturі non sunt, ut extra unionem Christi positos, condemnare ad mortem æternam, ad declarandam iram et potentiam suam.—

Hujus doctrinæ, ita ex Scripturis traditæ, magnus est usus.

Servit enim gloriæ gratiæ Dei adstruendæ, afflictis conscientiis solandis, impiis percellendis et securitati illorum excutiendæ.

Adstruit autem gratiam Dei: cum totam laudem vocationis, justificationis, adoptionis, et glorificationis nostræ, solius Dei misericordiæ transcribit, ademptam viribus, operibus, et meritis nostris.

Consolatur conscientias cum tentatione luctantes: quando illas de gratiosa Dei in Christo ab æterno ipsis decreta, et in tempore præstita, æternumque duratura benevolentia, certiores reddit, eamque, non ex operibus sed ex vocante, firmam ostendit.

Valet ad terrendos impios: quia docet, irrevocabile esse decretum Dei de infidelibus, et qui veritati non obtemperant, obediunt autem mendacio, æterno exitio adjudicandis.

Et propterea, non modo intra privatos parietes et in scholis, sed etiam in coetibus sanctorum in ecclesia Dei sonare debet hæc doctrina: hac tamen cautione observata, ut extra Scripturas nihil de illa doceatur, modo Scripturis usitato proponatur, et ad eundem finem, quem Scriptura illam tradens propositum habet, referatur. Armin. Disput. xv. p. 283, 284, 285.

Pleasure of God, he really means, not *God's Absolute Will and mere Sovereign Determination*, but, as he himself, in the same passage, explains the phrase, *The Benevolent Affection of God's Will.* So that, after all, he simply intimates: that *The salvation of any individual of our fallen race must be ascribed, not to his own merits, but to the Benevolent Affection of the Will of God; who might, had it so pleased him, have left the whole of mankind to perish unredeemed and unreconciled.*

Accordingly, when he comes to treat of the correlative decree of Reprobation, he distinctly advances the precise leading point, wherein his System differed from that of Calvin.

Reprobation, he tells us, is *The decree of God's Wrath or Severe Pleasure, by which he determines to condemn to eternal death those unbelievers, who, by their own fault and the just judgment of God,* ARE NOT ABOUT TO BELIEVE.

God's Prevision of man's future unbelief is, we find, when this mist of words is dissipated, made the CAUSE of Reprobation to everlasting death. Whence, obviously, on the Scheme of Arminius, *God's Prevision of man's future belief* must analogously be viewed as the CAUSE of Election to everlasting life.

In short, strong and decisive as may seem the language of the preceding citation; insomuch that many, who were not aware that they had been reading the statement of Arminius, might easily have deemed the author a Calvinist, just as they have rapidly pronounced the Seventeenth Article to be manifestly calvinistic: the real key to the whole matter is this; *Arminius held the doctrine of conditionally previsional Election to eternal happiness*, while *Calvin held the doctrine of unconditionally absolute Election to eternal happiness**.

* The Remonstrants roundly asserted, in the very language of their

2. But, whatever claim Arminius and the Arminians may have made to the countenance of the English Church: neither the Seventeenth Article itself, nor any part of her authorised documents, gives the slightest warrant for the validity of such a claim.

The Seventeenth Article, even if we admit its inculcation of that IDEALITY of Election which is common alike to Arminianism and to Calvinism, is wholly silent as to the CAUSE of Election asserted by the Arminians: and, no where, so far as I know, is *that* CAUSE alleged and maintained in any part either of the English Offices or of the English Homilies.

3. Hence I venture to pronounce: that no evidence exists,

opponents, that neither faith nor want of faith is the impelling CAUSE of God's decree, but solely the free and sovereign pleasure of God, who wills to pity this man and not to pity that man.

Neque fidem neque infidelitatem CAUSAM esse impulsivam decreti Dei, sed liberrimam Dei voluntatem, volentis hujus misereri, illius non misereri: damus tamen fidem et infidelitatem conditiones esse, sine quibus, nec hunc salvare, nec illum præterire, ex puro puto beneplacito visum fuit Deo. Epist. Remonst. ad Ext. p. 38.

By this, however, they meant only, that Predestination, so far as its *origin* is concerned, springs from the sovereign pleasure of God, who might, had it seemed good to him, have passed no such decree whatsoever: in point of *operation*, they contended, what they here disguise under the name of CONDITIONS, that God's Prevision of man's faith or of man's want of faith is the active and immediate CAUSE of man's Election or of man's Reprobation.

From such ambiguous and perhaps somewhat disingenuous phraseology, the excellent Bishop Hall would attempt to reconcile the parties: but the attempt, I fear, will always prove ineffectual. When two polemics use the same phraseology in different senses, a reconciliation, founded purely upon words, can scarcely be more than a hollow reconciliation. See Hall's Via Media, Works, vol. ix. p. 828.

I suspect, that many sciolists of the present day have no other notion of Arminianism, than a crude idea, that it is *A something, which, opposing Calvinism, stoutly denies altogether the doctrine of Election and Reprobation.* Never was there a more thorough misapprehension.

as to the Arminianism of the Anglican Church, any more than as to her Calvinism.

III. I am not aware, that the advocates of *Nationalism* have ever directly claimed the suffrage of the Church of England. Locke, at least, says nothing on the subject: and Pyle, whose theory is the same, is equally reserved.

In truth, to prefer any such claim were altogether nugatory: for, in the authorised Anglican Documents, not a shadow can be discovered of a Scheme, which, in point of IDEALITY, makes scriptural Election refer, not to *individuals*, but to *nations*. Let the Seventeenth Article, for instance, mean what it may: *individuals*, not *nations*, clearly constitute its subjects.

IV. The general conclusion from this investigation is: that, NEGATIVELY, *The Church of England upholds not any one of the three Systems, respectively denominated Calvinism and Arminianism and Nationalism.*

CHAPTER IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, RESPECTING ELECTION, INVESTIGATED POSITIVELY.

HAVING thus ascertained, NEGATIVELY, *What Scheme of Doctrine, respecting Election, the Church of England does not hold:* we may now, with some advantage, proceed to inquire, POSITIVELY, *What Scheme of doctrine, respecting Election, the Church of England does hold.*

Our inquiry into this matter will, of course, divide itself into two branches: *The* IDEALITY *of Election;* and *The* CAUSATION *of Election.*

I. Let us begin with investigating the IDEALITY of Election, as maintained and taught by the Church of England.

1. In an examination of the present description, we naturally first advert to a formal and professed enunciation of doctrine, if any such exist.

Now an enunciation of this precise sort will be found in the Seventeenth Article of the Anglican Church.

With the Seventeenth Article, therefore, our inquiry will, both the most regularly and the most legitimately, commence.

This Article, as it first came out of the hands of its author Archbishop Cranmer, when, in the year 1553, the Book of Articles was ratified and published, ran in terms following.

Predestination to life is the everlasting Purpose of God,

whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they, which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called, according to God's Purpose, by his Spirit working in due season: they be justified freely: they be made sons of adoption: they be made like the image of the only-begotten Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works: and, at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable, comfort, to godly persons and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall; whereby the devil doth thrust them, either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, though the decrees of Predestination be unknown to us, yet must we receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.*

Such was the original form of the famous Seventeenth Article.

* Burnet's Hist. of the Reform. vol. ii. part. ii. p. 296, 297.

Now, in order to understand its real drift and purport, we must obviously begin with ascertaining the sentiments of the illustrious individual, under whose influence, and in accordance with whose solicited advice, it was composed: and, when we shall thus have obtained the true key to the Article, we may then, with some reasonable prospect of advantage, apply it to the phraseology of the Article itself.

(1.) Melancthon, we have seen, in his reply to Cranmer, strongly reprobated that frequent introduction of new-fangled Schemes of Doctrine relative to Scriptural Election, which, in the way of mere unauthorised private exposition, sprang up from a neglect of simple and sincere Christian Antiquity*.

* Vides multiplices explicationes, et olim excogitatas esse, et nunc excogitari, quia negligitur simplex et sincera Vetustas. Melanc. Epist. lib. iii. epist. 44.

One of these phantasies was the System excogitated by Zuingle; which was received, I believe, only by his own followers; and which departs so utterly from the very principle of Election, though apparently founded upon a speculation of Justin Martyr, that I have not thought myself bound to notice it in the body of the present Work.

Justin imagined, that those virtuous heathens, such as Socrates and Heraclitus, who lived *with the Word* or *according to Reason* (the play, in the original, is untranslateable), might be deemed Christians, though they must be viewed as ignorant of the true God of revelation.

Τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν, καὶ προεμηνύσαμεν Λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε· καὶ οἱ μετὰ Λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν· οἷον ἐν Ἕλλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 65.

Taking the hint probably from this passage, Zuingle maintained, not only that virtuous heathens *might* possibly be saved through the merits of an innocently unknown Redeemer, but also that those heathens are to be counted in the number of God's Elect.

As Christ died for all men, he argued; *and as God is no respecter of persons; all, who possess faith or genuine piety, that is, who truly love*

Hence we may be quite sure, that the mode, in which Melancthon theologised, was the very reverse of that which he condemned: in other words, we may be quite sure, that Melancthon, when he renounced what he calls *The Stoical and Manichèan Insanity of Fatalism*, would resort to Christian Antiquity for the purpose of settling the true doctrine of *Scriptural Election and Predestination.*

In this wise and rational plan of theologising, Cranmer perfectly concurred: for, though most happy to solicit and to profit by the advice of such a Divine as Melancthon, he did not blindly build upon it; but, on the contrary, in composing the Seventeenth Article, he is stated, by his first protestant successor Parker, to have been most diligent, in reading the oldest Fathers both greek and latin, and in examining Ecclesiastical Antiquity quite up to the times of the Apostles*.

Now, purely in the way of coming at mere matter of fact, such a process must have convinced both Melancthon and

and fear God, whether they be Christians or Heathens, are indifferently elected.

Nihil vetat, quo minus inter gentes quoque Deus sibi deligat, qui sese revereantur, qui observent, et post fata illi jungantur: libera est enim Electio ejus. Zuing. Oper. vol. ii. p. 371.

Bullinger speaks exactly to the same purpose.

Deinde interrogatur: *An opera, quæ faciunt Gentiles, ac speciem habent probitatis vel virtutis, peccata sint, an bona opera.* Certum est, Deum et inter Gentiles habuisse suos Electos. Si qui tales fuerunt, non caruerunt Spiritu Sancto et Fide. Idcirco opera ipsorum facta ex fide bona fuerunt, non peccata. Bulling. Serm. Decad. Quinque. p. 174.

To such fancies, Melancthon would have promptly answered, that *Sincere Antiquity was altogether ignorant of any such interpretation of Scriptural Election.*

* Quibus perceptis, antiquissimos tam Græcos quam Latinos Patres evolvit: concilia omnia, et antiquitatem, ad ipsa Apostolorum tempora, investigavit. Parker. Cantuarens. Antiquit. Britann. p. 331.

Cranmer: that *The doctrine, maintained and taught by Primitive Antiquity, was, in point of* IDEALITY, *the doctrine of Ecclesiastical Individual Election.*

Accordingly, Melancthon, in delivering his sentiments on this topic, is full and express and unambiguous.

He contended: that *The Catholic Church collectively is the Election or the Elect Church of God; because, as a body, it is chosen out of the corrupt mass of the entire human race.* And thence he maintained: that *All the members of the Elect Catholic Church, inasmuch as they are thus component parts of the Election, constitute individually the Elect People of God*.*

* De effectu Electionis teneamus hanc consolationem: Deum, volentem non perire totum genus humanum, semper, propter Filium, per misericordiam vocare, trahere, et colligere, *Ecclesiam;* et recipere assentientes; atque ita velle semper aliquam esse *Ecclesiam*, quam adjuvat et salvat. Melanc. Loc. Theol. de Prædest.

Magna autem consolatio primum hæc est, quod certo scimus ex verbo Dei, Deum immensa misericordia, propter Filium, semper colligere *Ecclesiam* in genere humano, et quidem voce Evangelii.—Sed dices: *Hæc consolatio eo prodest, quod scio aliis servari Ecclesiam; fortassis autem mihi id nihil prodest: et quomodo sciam, qui sunt Electi?* Respondeo: *Tibi quoque hæc generalis consolatio prodest, quia credere debes, tibi quoque servari Ecclesiam: et mandatum Dei æternum et immotum est, ut tu quoque audias Filium, agas poenitentiam, et credas te recipi a Deo propter Mediatorem.* Talis cum es, discedens ex hac vita, certum est, te in numero Electorum esse: sicut scriptum est; *Quos justificat, eosdem et glorificat.* Melanc. Oper. vol. iv. p. 161.

Verè in *Ecclesia* recipit infantes: et lætemur *in coetu vocatorum electos esse.* Melanc. Oper. vol. i. p. 320.

In *eo coetu* sunt adhuc aliqui electi et sancti, ut pueri: et aliqui adulti rectè sentientes, sed infirmi; qui tamen sunt membra Christi. Melanc. Epist. in Opusc. Calvin.

Quos elegit, hos et vocavit. Attexit splendidissimam amplificationem de conservatione *Ecclesiæ*, in hac tanta deformitate, et in his confusionibus et ruinis regnorum: quasi dicat; *Quanquam omnia minantur interitum, tamen scitote, Ecclesiam curæ esse Deo, et non interituram esse.* Orditur

This being the view taken by Melancthon, he indisputably must have held the true ancient IDEALITY of Election to be *An Election of individuals, out of the great corrupt mass of mankind, into the pale of the visible Church, with God's morally-acting purpose and intention, that the Elect, profiting by their privileges of Election, should finally attain everlasting felicity.*

Such, as stated by himself, was the Doctrinal System of Melancthon; a System, professedly adopted from the pure source of Primitive Christian Antiquity: such, therefore, was the System, which Cranmer, acting by the advice of Melancthon, and in consequence of his own diligent researches

igitur ab Electione, ut nos commonefaciat de perpetuo consilio Dei et de conservatione *Ecclesiæ:* quasi dicat; *Scitote, esse Ecclesiam electam propter Filium.*—Semper aliqua hæreditas erit Filii Dei in genere humano. Et *hæc electa Ecclesia prædicatione colligitur, et fit justa, et ornabitur æterna gloria.* Mox igitur monet, *ubi Electi quærendi sint;* scilicet, *in coetu Vocatorum.* Ideo inquit; *Quos elegit, hos et vocavit.* Melanc. Oper. vol. iv. p. 154.

This, as we have seen, was the precise doctrine of the Primitive Church: and Melancthon, who studiously professed to defer to Antiquity, and who avowedly censured those new-fangled Schemes which sprang up from a neglect of Antiquity and from a consequent abuse of the legitimate right of private judgment, could, by no possibility, on *his* sound principles of inquiry, have adopted and maintained any other doctrine.

He states, we may further observe, with the utmost correctness, the mode, and the *only* mode, in which the Primitive Church held the tenet, that afterward, in the hands of Augustine and Calvin, was transmuted into the dogma of *The indefectible Final Perseverance of every individual among the Elect.* Christ had declared: that *He would found his Church upon a rock;* and that *The gates of hell should never prevail against it.* Hence Melancthon, with the early believers, justly maintained, we see, *The Final Perseverance of the collective Church of the Election,* insomuch that Christ should never be without *a Church of the Elect* even to the very end of the world, though individually *any one of the Elect* might fall away and finally perish.

into the same Antiquity, embodied in the Seventeenth Article of the Church of England.

(2.) To the phraseology, then, of that Article, opened by he key with which we have been furnished by the explicitness of Melancthon, let us now attend: reading the Article under the impression, that it was the Work of Cranmer: who had consulted Melancthon on the subject treated of in it; and who, like Melancthon, rejecting the various unauthoritative phantasies of mere licentious private judgment, had resorted to venerable Antiquity for information and instruction.

Election, whether absolute and unconditional, or previsional and conditional, is equally, both on the Calvinistic Scheme and on the Arminian Scheme, *An Election of certain individuals*, DIRECTLY *and* IMMEDIATELY, *to eternal life.*

But, as this notion agrees not with the IDEALITY of Election, maintained by the Primitive Church to be the true sense of Scripture: so, unless I greatly mistake, it agrees as little with the IDEALITY of Election, maintained, under the joint influence of Melancthon and Cranmer, by the reformed Church of England.

In respect to the point of IDEALITY, the Anglican Church, when, in the Seventeenth Article, she speaks of *Predestination to life*, teaches not *An Election of certain individuals, either absolute or previsional*, DIRECTLY *and* IMMEDIATELY, *to eternal happiness.* But she teaches *An Election of certain individuals into the Church Catholic, in order that there, according to the everlasting purpose and morally-operating intention of God, they may be delivered from curse and damnation, and thus*, INDIRECTLY *and* MEDIATELY, *may be brought through Christ to everlasting salvation; agreeably to God's promises, as they are* GENERICALLY, *not* SPECIFICALLY, *set forth to us in Holy Scripture.*

That such is the real doctrine of the Church of England; in other words, that she teaches *A Predestination to life, not* DIRECT *and* IMMEDIATE, *but* INDIRECT *and* MEDIATE: inevitably follows from the circumstance; that, while in her Sixteenth Article she hints at the possibility of the Elect *individually* departing from Grace given, in her Homilies and in her Burial Service she distinctly states, that the Elect, in *her* sense of the word, *may*, in their *individual* capacity, fall away utterly, and thus perish finally*. Now this statement is palpably incompatible with the tenet of *A* DIRECT *and* IMMEDIATE *Predestination of individuals to eternal life:* for individuals, *so* predestinated, *could not*, by the very terms of their Predestination, fall away utterly and irrecoverably. Therefore the *Predestination to life*, mentioned in the Seventeenth Article, can only mean *An* INDIRECT *and* MEDIATE *Predestination of individuals:* or, in other words, it can only mean *A Predestination of individuals to eternal life, through the* MEDIUM *of Election into the Catholic Church, in God's everlasting purpose and intention indeed; but still, since God in executing his purpose and intention operates upon the minds of his intelligent creatures not physically but morally, with a possibility of their defeating that merciful purpose and intention and thence of their finally falling away to everlasting destruction.*

As the Article, in connection with the other documents of the Anglican Church, must, unless we place them in irreconcileable collision with each other, be understood to propound the doctrine of *Predestination* after the manner and in the sense which has been specified: so it distinctly enjoins us to *receive God's promises, as they are* GENERALLY *set forth to us in Holy Scripture.*

The import of the word GENERALLY is, I suspect, very

* See below, § I. 2. (2.)

often and very widely misapprehended by the readers of the Seventeenth Article as it occurs in the English form. The term is thought to be equivalent to *Usually* or *For the most part:* and thence the clause is supposed to teach; that, in the matter of Election, God's promises must be received as they are most *usually* set forth in Scripture, so that, in the interpretation of Holy Writ, we must not set one text in opposition to another text.

But this is, in no wise, either the meaning of the term, or the drift of the clause.

From its ambiguity, the word GENERALLY has, no doubt, been infelicitously selected: but a moment's inspection of the Article in its latin form will shew us the true import of the term. Its sense is, not *Generally* as opposed to *Unusually*, but *Generally* as opposed to *Particularly**. Had the word GENERICALLY been used in the English form of the Article, instead of the word GENERALLY, all ambiguity would have been avoided: and thus the real drift of the clause would have stood out plain and distinct.

The latter part of the Article is an explanation of its former part. We must embrace the doctrine of *Predestination to life:* but then, as that Predestination, through the MEDIUM of Election into the Church Catholic, is, so far as respects PARTICULARS or INDIVIDUALS, only according to God's everlasting moral purpose and intention; the promises of God, in regard to Predestination and Election, must be received GENERICALLY, not SPECIFICALLY. That is to say, the promises of God must be received GENERICALLY, with a reference to *the whole collective Church of the Election;* which Christ has founded upon a rock, and which (agreeably to his express prophecy) can never be finally overturned: not re-

* In the latin form of the Seventeenth Article, the word employed is *Generaliter*, not *Plerumque*.

ceived SPECIFICALLY, with a reference to *a certain number of individuals of that Church;* whose particular Predestination to life might thence be erroneously pronounced absolute and irreversible.

In this explanation, furnished by the Article itself, we may plainly, in its very phraseology, detect the assisting hand of Melancthon: and, where his hand is detected, we can never doubt the real meaning.

Great is the comfort, says he, *that we assuredly know from the word of God: that, in his immense mercy, on account of his Son, God is always collecting* THE CHURCH *among mankind, and that he does it by the voice of the Gospel.—But you will say: This comfort avails, so far as my knowing that the Church is securely preserved for the benefit of others; but perhaps that will not at all profit myself: for how shall I know, who are the Elect? I answer: To thee also this* GENERIC *comfort is profitable; because thou oughtest to believe, that the Church is securely preserved for thy benefit also: and the commandment of God is eternal and immoveable, that thou also shouldest hear the Son, shouldest repent, and shouldest believe that thou wilt be received by God for the sake of the Mediator. Being such as thou art, it is certain, when thou departest from this life, that thou art in the number of the Elect*.*

* Magna autem consolatio primum hæc est, quod certo scimus ex verbo Dei, Deum immensa misericordia propter Filium semper colligere Ecclesiam in genere humano, et quidem voce Evangelii.—Sed dices: Hæc consolatio eo prodest, quod scio aliis servari Ecclesiam; fortassis autem mihi id nihil prodest: et quomodo sciam, qui sunt Electi? Respondeo: Tibi quoque hæc GENERALIS consolatio prodest, quia credere debes, tibi quoque servari Ecclesiam: et mandatum Dei æternum et immotum est, ut tu quoque audias Filium, agas pœnitentiam, et credas te recipi a Deo propter Mediatorem. Talis cum es, discedens ex hac vita, certum est, te in numero Electorum esse. Melanc. Oper. vol. iv. p. 161.

This doctrine of Melancthon and the Church of England, that *The*

Accordingly, in precise correspondence both with this language of Melancthon and with its own self-explanation by the use of the word GENERICALLY, the Article, throughout its entire composition, employs a phraseology, not singular or PARTICULAR, but plural or GENERICAL. It teaches, for instance, *every* member of the Church to speak of the godly consideration of *our* Election: and, in the latin form, though in the English exhibition of the Article the phraseology has been departed from, it further teaches *all* the members of the Church to say; that this godly consideration doth greatly confirm *our* faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, and doth vehemently kindle *our* love toward God*. Now such pluralising language, thus put into the mouth of *every* member of the Church, would palpably be improper, unless the author of the Article, like his friend and adviser Melancthon, had held and taught, that, in *his* sense of the word, *every* member of the Church Catholic or the Church of the Election was himself one of the Elect People of God.

Under this aspect, as the language of the Article is studiously GENERICAL: so, by describing the whole Collegiate Body of the Ecclesiastically Elect, as in God's moral purpose they are *intended* to be, and as by their profession they *ought* to be; its obvious design is to stir them up, so that they should make the proper GENERIC character of the Lord's Elect People their own personal PARTICULAR character.

scriptural promises of God must be understood GENERICALLY *and not* PARTICULARLY, stood so directly opposed to the System of Calvin that we cannot wonder at his specific opposition to it even in set terms.

Aliquid disserui, eorum errorem refellens, quibus GENERALITAS PROMISSIONUM videtur æquare totum genus humanum. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 24. § 1.

* Tum quia fidem *nostram*, de æterna salute consequenda per Christum, plurimum stabilit atque confirmat: tum quia amorem *nostrum* in Deum vehementer accendit.

In justification of such a principle, which remarkably runs through all the Offices of the English Church, and which in truth is borrowed from the drift of the pluralising apostolic phraseology itself, our reformers adduce the practice and authority of St. Paul.

That we should remember, say they, *to be holy, pure, and free from all uncleanness, the holy Apostle calleth us* SAINTS: *because we are sanctified and made holy by the blood of Christ through the Holy Ghost*.*

* Homily against adultery, part ii. Homil. p. 103. The sum of the matter, in short, is this. The Catholic Church collectively is the Church of the Election. Whence, according to our Lord's explicit promise that the gates of hell should never prevail against it, the Catholic Church, after her effectual calling, is endowed with the grace and privilege of final perseverance. But, as the seventeenth Article rightly teaches, the promises of God to such effect must be understood GENERICALLY respecting the Catholic Church of the Election, not SPECIFICALLY of every elect member of that Church. For, though the Church GENERICALLY *must*, according to the divine decree, finally persevere, and thence *cannot* fail of ultimately becoming the Church triumphant in heaven: yet individual members of the Church SPECIFICALLY *may* finally fall away from grace given, and thence *may* ultimately fail of obtaining the reward which is promised no otherwise than collectively. In fine, let the five calvinistic points of *Election*, *Particular Redemption*, *Original Sin*, *Effectual Calling*, and *Final Perseverance*, be predicated of Christ's Catholic Church GENERICALLY, agreeably to the doctrine of Melancthon and Cranmer; instead of being predicated of certain favoured individuals SPECIFICALLY, according to the doctrine of Augustine and Calvin: and perhaps we shall not err very widely in our reception of those five points. At least, we need only doubt, whether *Redemption* ought to be viewed, as *universal in regard to the whole world*, or as *universal in regard to the whole Church*. Should the *latter* modification be adopted, we shall have a Redemption, *universal* so far as the whole Church is concerned, but *particular* to the Church as contra-distinguished from the non-elect world at large. Our Anglican Reformers, however, as we shall presently see, appear to prefer the *former* modification; esteeming Redemption so universal, as to extend, not merely to all the members of the Church, but even to all mankind collectively.

In scriptural language, as it is almost superfluous to remark, the term SAINTS is virtually equivalent to the term ELECT.

The great influence, which Melancthon had in the composition of the Seventeenth Article, whence we conclude that it must be interpreted in accordance with his views on the topic of *Election*, is, in short, evident from the remarkable agreement of the very phraseology of the Article with the constant language of the German Reformer.

Of this coincidence we have already seen a striking instance in Melancthon's use of the word GENERIC, as coupled with the comfort to be derived from God's promises: it may not be useless, for our present purpose, to exhibit some other yet additional instances.

Whatever subtilty of disputation there may be concerning the doctrine of Election, it will profit the pious to hold: that THE PROMISE IS UNIVERSAL. *Nor ought we to judge of the Will of God any otherwise, than according to his revealed word: and we ought to know, that God has commanded us to believe.—We, therefore, in all simplicity, interpret this declaration* UNIVERSALLY: God willeth all men to be saved. *That is to say: He wills the salvation of all men, so far as his will or purpose or intention is concerned*.*

Let us hold fast these UNIVERSAL *sayings concerning* THE PROMISE: *and let us oppose all temptation concerning* PARTICULARITY, *when our minds incline to dispute, Whether such and such persons are in the number of the Elect? From a*

* Et si alia subtiliter de Electione disputari fortasse possunt: tamen prodest piis tenere, quod *Promissio sit universalis.* Nec debemus de voluntate Dei aliter judicare, quam juxta verbum revelatum: et scire debemus, quod Deus præceperit ut credamus.—Nos igitur simpliciter interpretamur hanc sententiam UNIVERSALITER. *Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri.* Scilicet, quod ad ipsius voluntatem attinet. Melanc. Oper. vol. iv. p. 498, 499.

disputation of this sort, let us rather pass to THE REVEALED WILL OF GOD *in the Gospel: and let us believe God's own express word: and let us include ourselves within* THE UNIVERSAL PROMISE. *That this promise appertains to us also, let us be convinced: and let us know, that the Son of God is a true messenger; through whom, from the bosom of the Eternal Father, the promise is declared: nor, inasmuch as God is true, let us idly feign contradictory wills concerning the same matter. This* COMFORT, *derived from the express word, let us hold fast: nor let us entangle ourselves in those inextricable labyrinths of disputation, which overturn the faith*.*

Whom he chose, them also he called. This sentence contains A SWEET AND SALUTARY AND MANIFOLD COMFORT†.

After such an examination, based upon such grounds, we can scarcely, I think, doubt: that the IDEALITY of Election, propounded in the Seventeenth Article, is that of *An Election or Predestination of individuals into the pale of the visible Church,* IN ORDER TO *their eternal salvation, so far as God's purpose or intention is concerned, through*

* Hæc *Universalia* dicta de promissione teneamus: et opponamus tentationi de *Particularitate*, cum disputant mentes, *An sint in numero Electorum?* Ab hac disputatione, ad revelatam Dei voluntatem in Evangelio deducamur: et credamus expresso verbo Dei: et nos in universalem promissionem includamus. Sciamus eam ad nos quoque pertinere: sciamus Filium Dei veracem nuncium esse, per quem prolata est promissio ex sinu æterni Patris: nec fingamus de eadem re contradictorias voluntates in Deo, quia Deus verax est. Hanc consolationem, sumptam ex verbo expresso, teneamus: nec ipsos inextricabilibus labyrinthis disputationum implicemus, quæ fidem evertunt. Melanc. Oper. vol. iv. p. 86.

† Item Rom. viii: *Quos elegit, hos et vocavit.* Dulcem, salutarem, et multiplicem, consolationem, continet hæc sententia. Melanc. Loc. Theol. de Prædest. p. 475.

sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth in Christ Jesus.*

2. If, however, such be the IDEALITY of Election main-

* It is remarkable, that the phrase, *Election to salvation*, occurs only once in Holy Scripture.

God hath, from the beginning, elected you to salvation, εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν, *through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.* 2 Thess. ii. 13.

The phrase, as here used by St. Paul, is evidently the basis and authority of the equipollent phrase, *Predestination to life*, as employed in the Seventeenth Article.

Hence the question is: *How we are to understand the scriptural phrase before us.*

Arminians and Calvinists equally suppose it to mean, *An Election specially and immediately* UNTO *salvation itself, so that all the Elect will assuredly be saved.*

But the Primitive Church, and after it the reformers of the Church of England (as I contend), believed it to mean only, *A generic Election* IN ORDER TO *the salvation of the elected individuals.*

The question is decided in favour of the latter, by a parallel phrase also employed by St. Paul, the grammatical construction of which requires the sense of IN ORDER TO.

In whom also we have received an inheritance, being predestinated, according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, IN ORDER TO *our being to the praise of his glory.* Ephes. i. 11, 12.

Agreeably to this decision, he speaks of Election, as respecting only a HOPE of eternal life, not as respecting that absolute irreversible CERTAINTY of it which alike characterises the two Systems of Calvin and of Arminius. Tit. i. 1, 2.

So far as the promises are *generically* set forth in Scripture, God, as the Apostle remarks, cannot lie. But promises of eternal life, made to the Church *collectively*, will not, when a wicked course attended with final impenitence intervenes, be fulfilled *individually.*

Agreeably to the same decision, he writes to Timothy: *I endure all things on account of the Elect*, IN ORDER THAT, ἵνα, *they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.* 2 Tim. ii. 10.

Here we learn, that, since the People of God are elected IN ORDER

tained by the English Church in her Seventeenth Article, we may be sure, that a strict correspondence with this IDEALITY will be found in her other authorised documents: while, if such be *not* the IDEALITY of Election in the judgment

TO their salvation, due means must be taken IN ORDER TO their finally attaining that salvation.

The propriety of this view of the matter is, in short, confirmed, by the sense in which the kindred verb σώζω is perpetually employed by the inspired writers of the New Testament.

With them, that verb denotes, not only *to save* absolutely and finally in the next world, but also *to bring into a state of salvability* in this present world.

Thus the members of Christ's Church, even while still living, are said to be *saved:* not that they are all *actually saved* on this side of the grave, for we have but too much reason to fear that some perish everlastingly; but that, by their Election into the Church, they are *brought into the high privileges of a salvable condition.*

He said unto the woman: Thy faith hath saved thee (that is, *hath put thee in a state of salvation*); *go in peace.* Luke vii. 50.

We have been saved (that is, *we have been brought into a salvable state*) *by hope.* Rom. viii. 24.

By which also ye are saved (that is, *are brought into a condition of salvability*), *if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain.* 1 Corinth. xv. 2.

By grace ye have been saved (that is, *have been brought into a state of salvation*), *through faith.* Ephes. ii. 8.

Who hath saved us (that is, *hath brought us into a salvable condition*), *and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.* 2 Tim. i. 9.

Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us (that is, *put us in a state of salvation*) *by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.* Tit. iii. 5.

The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us (that is, *doth also now bring us into a salvable condition*); *not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.* 1 Pet. iii. 21.

Thus also, collectively, the members of Christ's Church, are described as being *The Saved:* by which title we must clearly under-

of the English Church, we may be no less sure, that the error of interpretation, into which I shall *then* have fallen, will, by those other authorised documents, be readily and effectually corrected,

With this view, then, let us see: *Whether the remarks, which have been made upon the Seventeenth Article, are corroborated, or are contradicted, by the language of the other authorised documents of the Church of England.*

The several matters, to be established, are: that *The English Church holds, in point of* IDEALITY, *the doctrine of An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Church, with God's will or purpose or intention, that, profiting by their privileges, they should finally be saved;* that *She also holds A moral Possibility of those Elect Persons so falling away from Grace, as finally and irrecoverably, through*

stand, not *The Saved absolutely and in the next world*, but *The Brought into a state of salvability in this world.*

The Lord daily added The Saved to the Church. Acts ii. 47.

To The Lost, the preaching of the cross is foolishness: but, to us The Saved, it is the power of God. 1 Corinth. i. 18.

We are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in The Saved and in The Lost. 2 Corinth. ii. 15.

On the whole, therefore, we cannot reasonably doubt, that the *Election to Salvation*, mentioned in 2 Thess. ii. 13, imports *An Election* IN ORDER TO *Salvation*, or, in other words, *An Election to all the privileges and advantages of a state of salvability.*

Perhaps I may be permitted to subjoin, as exhibiting the perfect familiarity of such construction to the early Church, that the Catecheses of Cyril, addressed to those who were *preparing* for baptism, but who had *not* as yet been baptised, are throughout denominated, Αἱ τῶν φωτιζομένων κατηχήσεις, *The Catecheses of the Illuminated.*

Here the term *Illuminated* is used precisely in the same construction, as the term *Saved* is used by the writers of the New Testament. It is employed to denote, not *Persons actually illuminated by the already past canonical reception of baptism*, but *Persons brought into a capability of illumination by a due catechetical preparation for that sacrament about to be received by them.*

their own perverseness, to perish; and that, in strict accordance with God's promises as they are generically set forth in Holy Scripture, *She further holds the doctrine of Universal, as opposed to Particular, Redemption.*

If, from the authorised documents of the Church of England, these three matters can be established: we shall then have no reasonable doubt, as to the correctness of the preceding interpretation of the Seventeenth Article.

(1.) The first matter to be established is: that, *In the authorised documents of the English Church, the* IDEALITY *of Election is described, as being that of An Election of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Church, with God's morally-operating will or purpose or intention that they should be finally saved.*

This matter, if I mistake not, is amply established, even in the commencement of our inquiry, by the peculiar phraseology introduced into the Office of Infant-Baptism.

Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy Congregation: sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin: and grant, that this child, now to be baptised therein, may receive the fulness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and ELECT *children, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

Thus, in systematically generalising phraseology, runs the prayer. Now the same prayer is recited over *every* child. Consequently, by the inevitable force of the word *remain* as here used, EVERY child, baptismally brought into the pale of the Church, is declared to be, at that time, one of the number of GOD'S ELECT.

But the largest charity cannot believe: that EVERY child, baptismally brought into the pale of the Church, is ELECT in the sense of *Election* as jointly maintained by Calvin and Arminius.

Therefore, agreeably to the tenor of her own explicit phraseology, the IDEA, which the English Church annexes to the term *Election*, can only be that of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election*.

The matter is yet additionally established by the parallel phraseology, which occurs in the somewhat more modern Office of Adult-Baptism.

With the sole requisite alteration of *this person* for *this child*, the prayer is copied verbatim from the older Office. *Every* adult, therefore, who is baptismally introduced into the pale of the Church, is, *as such*, declared to be one of the number of GOD'S ELECT PEOPLE.

The same matter is still further established by the strictly homogeneous language of the Catechism.

Each questioned Catechumen, who, as an admitted member of the Church, has already, in the Baptismal Office, been declared to be one of the ELECT, is directed to reply: that, as a chief article of the Faith propounded in the Creed, he has learned to *believe in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth* HIM *and* ALL THE ELECT PEOPLE OF GOD.

Now such an answer plainly makes *every* Catechumen declare HIMSELF to be ONE OF THE ELECT.

But, in no conceivable sense which will harmonise with the general phraseology of the Anglican Church, save in that of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election* only, can *every* Catechumen be deemed ONE OF GOD'S ELECT PEOPLE.

Therefore, the IDEA, which, to the scriptural term *Election*, is annexed by the Church of England, is that of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election**.

* With the Catechism of the English Church, that of the Palatine Churches may here be usefully compared.

Quid credis de sancta et catholica Christi Ecclesia?

Credo Filium Dei, ab initio mundi ad finem usque, sibi, ex universo

The matter is also established by the parallel phraseology introduced into the Burial Service.

We beseech thee, that it may please thee, of thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish THE NUMBER OF THINE ELECT *and to hasten thy kingdom: that* WE, *with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

In this prayer, the generic term WE occurs in immediate connection with THE NUMBER OF THINE ELECT.

Therefore the evidently studied arrangement of the words enforces the conclusion: that EVERY member of the Church, as designated by the term WE, must be deemed one of GOD'S ELECT PEOPLE*.

genere humano, coetum ad vitam æternam electum, per Spiritum suum et verbum, in vera fide consentientem, colligere, tueri, ac servare, meque vivum ejus coetus membrum esse, et perpetuo mansurum. Catech. Heidel. in Syllog. Confess. p. 373.

* The prayer, here cited from the Burial-Service, may be usefully compared with the locally corresponding prayer, which occurs in the older Burial-Service, as set forth in the reign of King Edward.

Almighty God, we give thee hearty thanks for this thy servant, whom thou hast delivered from the miseries of this wretched world, from the body of death, and from all temptation; and, as we trust, hast brought his soul, which he committed into thy holy hands, into sure consolation and rest. Grant, we beseech thee, that, at the day of judgment, HIS *soul and all the souls of* THINE ELECT, *departed out of this life, may, with* US, *and* WE *with* THEM, *fully receive thy promises, and be made perfect* ALL TOGETHER, *through the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.*

This prayer was, obviously enough, relinquished, because, in the spirit of a not yet perfectly abandoned superstition, it contains a petition for the souls of the dead: but that circumstance does not render it less valuable as evidence in the matter of our *present* inquiry. Most plainly, both the departed individual, and the whole congregation who attend him to the grave, are viewed as being in the number of GOD'S ELECT,

Finally, the same matter is established, even in the familiar course of daily recitation, by the language of the very Litany itself.

Endue thy ministers with righteousness: and make THY CHOSEN PEOPLE *joyful.*

O Lord, save thy people: and bless thine inheritance.

Now, who are THE CHOSEN PEOPLE, whom the Lord is here supplicated to make joyful?

Can we reasonably pronounce them, in the judgment of the Anglican Church, to be *Certain individuals of each actually praying Congregation, who, in contradistinction to other individuals of the same Congregation, are predestinated, either absolutely or previsionally, to eternal life?*

Assuredly, the whole context forbids so incongruous a supposition: for, assuredly, the whole context requires us to pronounce, that THY CHOSEN PEOPLE are identical with THINE INHERITANCE.

But the entire tenor of the Liturgy identifies THINE INHERITANCE with THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Therefore, THY CHOSEN PEOPLE and THE CATHOLIC CHURCH are terms, in point of import, identical.

(2.) The second matter to be established is: that *The Church of England holds a moral possibility of the Elect so falling from grace, as finally and irrecoverably, through their own perverseness, to perish.*

Since the Anglican Church, with the Primitive Church, made (we have seen) the IDEALITY of Election to respect *An Admission into the pale of the visible Church Catholic,* not *A necessary and infallible Admission into eternal glory:* she obviously could not teach the doctrine of *The assured Final Perseverance of every individual among the Elect;*

according to the sense in which the word *Election* is understood by the Church of England.

but, annexing a totally different sense to the word *Elect* itself from that which is jointly advocated by Calvin and by Arminius, she consistently pronounced, that the *Elect*, as *she* understood the term, *might* finally fall away, and thence *might* everlastingly perish.

To this moral possibility of Final Apostasy the Anglican Church, as was felt by the Calvinistic Party in the conference at Hampton Court, alludes, though she does not specifically there define the matter, in her Sixteenth Article.

After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from Grace given and fall into sin: and, by the Grace of God, we may arise again, and amend our lives.

Here it seems to be not obscurely intimated: that *The Elect, even after they have received the Holy Ghost, may so depart from Grace given, and may so fall into sin; that they either may, or may not, be restored by the influential Grace of God.*

Such, accordingly, was doubtless perceived to be the case by the Calvinistic Party: for, otherwise, it is impossible to account for their proposed alteration of the Article, which would have made it speak the language of *Assured Personal Final Perseverance.*

They moved King James: that, to the original words of the Article; *After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from Grace given and fall into sin:* might be subjoined the following explanatory addition; *Yet neither totally nor finally*.*

Had this addition been made, the Article would doubtless have taught the doctrine of *The Final Perseverance of all the Elect.* The wish to make it imported a consciousness, that the Reformed Anglican Church held no such doctrine.

* See Abp. Laurence's Bampt. Lect. p. 191.

Nor was this consciousness ill founded: the Homily on *Falling from God*, as we might anticipate from its very title, distinctly asserts, in both its parts, the moral possibility, in the Elect, of finally departing from Grace given, and of thus perishing everlastingly.

By all these examples of Holy Scripture, we may know: that, as we forsake God, so SHALL HE EVER FORSAKE US. *And, what miserable state doth consequently and necessarily follow thereupon, a man may easily consider by the terrible threatenings of God. And, although he consider not all the said misery to the uttermost, being so great that it passeth any man's capacity in this life sufficiently to consider the same: yet he shall soon perceive so much thereof, that, if his heart be not more than stony or harder than the adamant, he shall fear, tremble, and quake, to call the same to his remembrance.—*

When God withdraweth from us his word, the right doctrine of Christ, his gracious assistance and aid (which is ever joined to his word); and leaveth us to our own wit, our own will and strength: he declareth then, that HE BEGINNETH TO FORSAKE US. *For, whereas God hath shewed, to all them that truly believe his Gospel, his face of mercy in Jesus Christ; which doth so lighten their hearts, that they (if they behold it as they ought to do) be transformed to his image, be made partakers of the heavenly light and of his Holy Spirit, and be fashioned to him in all goodness requisite to the children of God: so, if they do after neglect the same, if they be unthankful unto him, if they order not their lives according to his example and doctrine and to the setting forth of his glory:* HE WILL TAKE AWAY FROM THEM HIS KINGDOM, *his holy word, whereby he should reign in them, because they bring not forth the fruit thereof that he looked for.*

Nevertheless, he is so merciful and of so long sufferance, that he doth not shew upon us that great wrath suddenly,

But, when we begin to shrink from his word, not believing it or not expressing it in our livings: first, he doth send his messengers, the true preachers of his word, to admonish and warn us of our duty: that, as he, for his part, for the great love he bare unto us, delivered his own Son to suffer death, that we by his death might be delivered from death, and be restored to life everlasting, evermore to dwell with him and to be partakers and inheritors with him of his everlasting glory and kingdom of heaven: so, again, that we, for our parts, should walk in a godly life, as becometh his children to do.

And, if this will not serve, but still we remain disobedient to his word and will, not knowing him, nor loving him, nor fearing him, nor putting our whole trust and confidence in him; and, on the other side, to our neighbours behaving ourselves uncharitably, by disdain, envy, malice, or by committing murder, robbery, adultery, gluttony, deceit, lying, swearing, or other like detestable works and ungodly behaviour: then he threateneth us by terrible comminations, swearing in great anger, that, WHOSOEVER DOTH THESE WORKS, SHALL NEVER ENTER INTO HIS REST, WHICH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.—

By these threatenings, we are monished and warned: that, if WE WHICH ARE THE CHOSEN VINEYARD OF GOD *bring not forth good grapes, that is to say, good works that may be delectable and pleasant in his sight, when he looketh for them, when he sendeth his messengers to call upon us for them; but rather bring forth wild grapes, that is to say, sour works, unsavoury and unfruitful: then will he pluck away all defence, and suffer grievous plagues of famine, battle, dearth, and death, to light upon us.*

Finally, if these serve not, he will let us lie waste, he will give us over, he will turn away from us, he will dig and delve no more about us, he will let us alone, and suffer us to bring

forth even such fruit as we will, to bring forth brambles, briers, and thorns, all naughtiness, all vice, and that so abundantly, that they shall clean overgrow us, CHOKE, STRANGLE, AND UTTERLY DESTROY US.—

GOD AT LENGTH DOTH SO FORSAKE HIS UNFRUITFUL VINEYARD, *that he will not only suffer it to bring forth weeds, briers, and thorns; but also, further to punish the unfruitfulness of it, he saith, he will not cut it, he will not delve it, and he will command the clouds that they shall not rain upon it: whereby is signified the teaching of his holy word, which St. Paul, after a like manner, expressed by planting and watering; meaning, that he will take that away from them, so that* THEY SHALL BE NO LONGER OF HIS KINGDOM, *they shall be no longer governed by his Holy Spirit, they shall be put from the grace and benefits that they had and ever might have enjoyed through Christ; they shall be deprived of the heavenly light and life, which they had in Christ while they abode in him;* THEY SHALL BE, AS THEY WERE ONCE, AS MEN WITHOUT GOD IN THIS WORLD, OR RATHER IN WORSE TAKING.

And, to be short, they shall be given into the power of the devil, which beareth the rule IN ALL THEM THAT BE CAST AWAY FROM GOD, *as he did in* SAUL *and* JUDAS, *and generally in all such as work after their own wills, the children of mistrust and unbelief.*

Let US *beware, therefore,* GOOD CHRISTIAN PEOPLE, *lest that* WE, *rejecting or casting away God's word (by the which we obtain and retain true faith in God),* BE NOT AT LENGTH CAST OFF SO FAR, THAT WE BECOME AS CHILDREN OF UNBELIEF*.

On this strong and decisive passage, we may observe: that, with the same IDEALITY of Election itself as that which pervades the Offices of the English Church, the whole body

* Homil. of Falling from God, part i and ii. Homil. p. 67, 68, 69–72. Oxon.

of the visible Church Catholic is denominated *The Chosen Vineyard of God;* while yet particular Churches may be rejected as *Unfruitful Vineyards*, and while yet the individual Elect Members of the Catholic Church of the Election are described, notwithstanding their own personal election, as liable to fall away from Grace given, and thence as liable to be finally rejected and to perish everlastingly.

It may be proper to remark: that the preceding extract is taken from the *first* book of the Homilies; a book peculiarly valuable in the way of evidence, since it is more ancient than the *second* book. For the *first* book was put forth in the reign of Edward; while the *second* was not published until the reign of Elizabeth. Consequently, the extract displays the views and sentiments of the *earliest* Reformers of the Church of England.

The doctrine of *The possibility of the Elect finally falling away from grace to perdition;* a doctrine, which, in truth, is nothing more than the inevitable and necessary result of that IDEALITY of Election, which, from primitive Antiquity, has been adopted by the Anglican Church: is, very distinctly and very affectingly, propounded also in her admirable and sublime Burial Service.

Spare US, *Lord most holy, O God most mighty, O holy and merciful Saviour, thou most worthy judge eternal, suffer* US *not, at* OUR LAST HOUR, *for any pains of death,* TO FALL FROM THEE.

The prayer before us is couched in the pluralising form: and the persons, who are directed concurrently with the officiating Minister to use it, are those identical persons, who, having been chosen in the course of divine providence and brought by baptism into the pale of the visible Church, have thence been declared to be *The Elect People of God.*

Consequently, those, who, in the judgment of the Church

of England, are *The Elect People of God*, are nevertheless directed to pray: that the Lord would not suffer *them*, at *their* last hour, for any pains of death, *to fall from him.*

Hence, as the English Church understands the term *Elect*, it is possible, from the very necessity of such a prayer, that those, who are Elect, may not only *for a season* fall away from God and be afterward renewed by repentance, but may even fall away from him *at their last hour*, which is doubtless equivalent to their falling away from him *totally* and *finally.*

If any thing more were wanting to establish the present matter, I might adduce the avowed opinion of that Melancthon, whose influence and advice were so powerful with Cranmer in the compilation and construction of the Anglican Doctrinal Articles.

Let us, says he, *meditate upon the two several examples of Saul and David. Before their respective falls, they enjoyed the benefits which I have enumerated: and, after their respective falls, being stripped of those great blessings, they endured the punishments which I have recited. Yet Saul altogether perished, oppressed with eternal punishment: while David was again converted to God*.*

Those, who are led by the Holy Spirit, are the Sons of God: but, when they rush against the dictates of their conscience, they expel and disturb the Holy Spirit. THEY CEASE, THEREFORE, TO BE THE SONS OF GOD†.

* Exempla cogitemus Saulis et Davidis: qui et beneficia, quæ recensui, tenuerunt ante lapsum; et, post lapsum exuti tantis bonis, poenas senserunt, quas recitavi. Et Saul prorsus periit, oppressus æternis poenis: David vero rursus ad Deum conversus est. Melanc. Loc. Theol. p. 431.

† Qui aguntur Spiritu Sancto, hi sunt filii Dei. Sed, ruentes contra conscientiam, effundent et perturbant Spiritum Sanctum. Desinunt ergo esse filii Dei. Melanc. Loc. Theol. p. 280.

I affirm, that persons, who fall into such crimes, shake off the Holy Spirit, and again become liable to eternal punishment. Of these, some, returning to penitence, like Aaron and David, are again converted to God, and are received to grace: but MANY, NOT RETURNING, RUSH INTO ETERNAL PUNISHMENT*.

It cannot here be said: that, in the judgment of Melancthon, those, who returned, were the Elect in the calvinistic sense of the word; while those, who did not return and who thence finally perished, were only the Reprobate who had never been subjects of Divine Grace. For such a gloss would not alone contradict Melancthon's known sentiments on the topic of Election, but it would likewise make the passages contradictory to themselves. They who return, and they who do not return, are *alike* described, as having, previous to their lapse, been led by the Holy Spirit, and thence as having equally been the sons of God. Yet, according to Melancthon, those very persons, who have once through the Spirit been the sons of God, may so fall away as never to be restored: and, thence, may finally rush into eternal punishment†.

* Affirmo etiam, labentes in talia scelera, excutere Spiritum Sanctum, et rursus fieri reos æternæ poenæ. Quorum aliqui, redeuntes ad poenitentiam, ut Aaron, David, rursus ad Deum convertuntur, et recipiuntur in gratiam: multi, non redeuntes, ruunt in æternas poenas. Melanc. Oper. vol. i. p. 375.

† Exactly the same doctrine is publicly avowed in the Confesssion of the Saxon Churches, drawn up by Melancthon, and presented to the Council of Trent in the year 1551.

Semper in conspectu sic hæc necessitas: si effundantur beneficia Dei, justificatio et regeneratio, amitti vitam æternam. Confess. Saxon. sect. ix. Syllog. Confess. p. 266.

Verum est, eos, qui effundunt Spiritum Sanctum, deficientes a fide, aut ruentes contra conscientiam, nec redeunt ad Deum per poenitentiam, non esse hæredes. Ibid. sect. x. p. 268.

Manifestum est, aliquos renatos contristare et excutere Spiritum

(3.) The third matter to be established is: that *The Church of England holds the doctrine of Universal, as opposed to Particular, Redemption.*

With *her* estimate of the IDEALITY of Election, she finds no inconsistency in maintaining this doctrine: a doctrine irreconcileable with the Scheme of *Augustinian or Calvinistic Election*, and therefore painfully explained away both by Augustine and by Calvin, though our modern Semicalvinists profess to hold it.

In reply to a question, as to *What Articles of Faith are chiefly learned in the Creed*, the Catechumen is directed to answer: *I believe in God the Son*, WHO HATH REDEEMED ME AND ALL MANKIND.

Now the doctrine of *Calvinistic Election* renders it nugatory and inconsistent to hold, conjointly with that doctrine, the tenet of *Universal Redemption.* Hence, on calvinistic principles, the doctrine of *The Particular Redemption of the Elect alone* is rightly and logically made one of the five Points, under which, at the Synod of Dort, the entire Scheme of Augustine and Calvin was arranged.

But the ancient primeval doctrine of *Ecclesiastical Individual Election*, as received by the Church of England, presents no impediment. For, though, in her Eighteenth Article, that Church condemns those who hold; that *Every one shall be saved* BY *the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature:* yet she no where teaches; that, *Through the infinite though uncovenanted mercies of God, a man cannot be saved* IN *a state of virtuous Heathenism* BY *the alone merits of Jesus Christ.*

I do not conceive, that we have any special business to

Sanctum, et rursus abjici a Deo, ac fieri reos iræ Dei et æternarum poenarum. Ibid. sect. xi. p. 269.

pronounce upon the fate of those, who have never heard the sound of the Gospel, whose reception of it was thence a physical impossibility, and whose unbelief of it was involuntary and therefore so far innocent: a condition, certainly very different from that of persons, who have known the Gospel only to despise it and to reject it. Yet it is difficult to hold the doctrine of *Universal Redemption*, without admitting the *possibility* at least of salvation *through* Christ, to those, who, in the mysterious course of God's providence, have never been privileged to hear the *name* of Christ. Our Reformers, very wisely, do not enter upon this difficult question; thus, to the members of the Church of England, leaving it an open question: and I cannot do better than follow the example of their prudent moderation.

II. From the IDEALITY of Election as held by the English Church, I proceed to investigate her doctrine of CAUSATION.

1. Here, as before, I shall begin with ascertaining the sentiments of Melancthon: for those sentiments, I conceive, furnish the real key to the entire Doctrinal System of the Church of England in regard to Election and Predestination.

Now the Scheme, which originated with Clement of Alexandria and which was subsequently taken up by the Arminians; the Scheme, to wit, that the moving CAUSE of Election is *God's Prevision of man's future righteousness:* this Scheme Melancthon expressly rejected, as one which could only have sprung from a gross ignorance of real evangelical principles.

The more recent Schoolmen, says he, *purely by man's judgment, determined: that The Merits or the Good Works of Human Free Will are the moving* CAUSE *of Election. This imagination arose from an ignorance of the Gospel**.

* Recentiores Scholastici, tantum humano judicio, dixerunt CAUSAM Electionis esse *Merita seu Bona Opera Liberæ Voluntatis humanæ.* Et

In accordance with this his renunciation of the System which makes *Foreseen Human Merit* the moving CAUSE of Election, he defined the true CAUSE of Election to be precisely the same as the true CAUSE of Justification*.

That is to say, as he himself explains his meaning, he pronounced the true CAUSE of Election to be *God's Mercy, for Christ's sake, operating according to God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure*†.

2. Such, in regard to CAUSATION, was the doctrine of Melancthon. In opposition, indeed, to the fatalising Scheme which denies altogether any exercise of Free Will, he asserted: that, although, in the strict and higher sense, *Man's Worthiness* is not the moving CAUSE of his primary Election; yet, in a lower sense, the CAUSE of his secondary or completed Election may be said to be in himself, since *Will or Inclination on the part of the person elected* must concur with the efficacious influence of the Holy Spirit, and since those alone are elected who by faith apprehend God's mercy and who do not ultimately cast away that confidence‡. But still, in regard to CAUSATION, such was the doctrine of Melancthon. With him, *The Free and Sove-*

hæc imaginatio orta est ex ignoratione Evangelii. Melanc. Oper. vol. iii. p. 1014.

* Non alia CAUSA Prædestinationis, quam Justificationis, quærenda est. Melanc. Loc. Theol. de Prædest.

† Rectè dicitur CAUSAM Electionis esse *Misericordiam in Voluntate Dei, qui non vult perire totum genus humanum, sed propter Filium colligit et servat Ecclesiam.* Melanc. Loc. Theol. p. 473.

‡ Tum cum statuendum sit promissionem verè universalem, quod ad voluntatem Dei attinet, sicut a posteriore in Justificatione dicimus aliquam in accipiente CAUSAM esse; videlicet, non *Dignitatem*, sed *Quia promissionem apprehendit cum qua Spiritus Sanctus est efficax:* quemadmodum Paulus inquit, *Fides ex auditu est:* ita et, de Electione, a posteriore judicemus; videlicet, haud dubiè electos esse, *qui misericordiam*

reign Grace of God in Christ, not *Human Merit foreseen as about to exist in the future subjects of God's conditional*

fide apprehendunt nec abjiciunt eam fiduciam ad extremum. Melanc. Loc. Theol. de Prædest.

This doctrine, the evident object of which is to guard against the Scheme of *Absolute Manichèan Fatalism,* and thus to uphold the System of God's moral government, was, however, pointedly attacked by Calvin.

Quanquam satis jam liquet, Deum, occulto consilio, liberè, quos vult, eligere, aliis rejectis: nondum tamen, nisi dimidia ex parte, exposita est gratuita ejus Electio, donec ad singulas personas ventum fuerit, quibus Deus non modo salutem offert, sed ita assignat, ut suspensa vel dubia non sit effectus certitudo. Calvin. Instit. lib. iii. c. 21. § 7.

Alii,—nescio qua ratione inducti, Electionem a posteriori suspendunt, quasi dubia esset atque etiam inefficax, donec fide confirmetur. Ibid. lib. iii. c. 24. § 3.

Melancthon's doctrine, that *the concurrence of the human will, through grace becoming a good will,* must, in an inferior and secondary sense, be deemed a joint CAUSE of God's Election, was strongly maintained by Jerome; even though he warmly and justly contended, that *Man's personal holiness* is the CONSEQUENCE, not the CAUSE, of that Election.

Vocatio volentes colligit, non invitos. Hieron. Comment. in Rom. viii. 30. Oper. vol. viii. p. 177.

Non gentes eligi, sed hominum voluntates. Hieron. ad Hedib. Epist. cl. quæst. 10. Oper. vol. iii. p. 353.

Non ait Paulus: *Elegit nos ante constitutionem mundi,* CUM *essemus sancti et immaculati;* sed *Elegit nos,* UT *essemus sancti et immaculati;* hoc est, qui sancti et immaculati antè non fuimus, ut postea essemus. Hieron. Comment. in Ephes. i. Oper. vol. vi. p. 162.

The Helvetic Confession seems also to insist on much the same doctrine.

Regeneratos in boni electione et operatione, non tantum agere passivè, sed activè. Aguntur enim a Deo, ut agant ipsi, quod agunt. Rectè enim Augustinus adducit illud, quod Deus dicitur noster adjutor. Nequit autem adjuvari, nisi is, qui aliquid agit. Manichæi spoliabant hominem omni actione, et veluti saxum et truncum faciebant. Confess. Helvet. sect. ix. Syllog. Confess. p. 32, 33.

That the doctrine is free from *all* difficulty, no person, I suppose, will assert. For, if God worketh in us both to *will* and to *do* of his good

Choice, is defined to be the moving CAUSE of Election. Such, therefore, from Cranmer's known consultation of Melancthon upon the subject, we may reasonably infer, is also, in regard to CAUSATION, the intended doctrine of the Anglican Church.

(1.) The Seventeenth Article, for whatever reason on the part of its author, is wholly silent on the point: at least, it is wholly silent in the way of specific definition.

Yet, though wholly silent so far as specific definition is concerned, it contains an apparent allusion to Melancthon's views, which may help to throw some light upon the matter.

Melancthon, as we have just seen, maintained the CAUSE of Election to be identical with the CAUSE of Justification: so that, if the CAUSE of the *one* were specified, the CAUSE of the *other* would be specified also.

Now, in the Seventeenth Article, it is declared of the Elect; that *They be justified* FREELY: that is to say, when the collateral language of the Eleventh Article is taken into the account, it is declared of the Elect; that *They be justified* FREELY *through the alone merits of Christ.*

But *The Free Grace of God's Will through the alone merits of Christ* is, by Melancthon, defined to be the moving CAUSE of Election.

If, then, as we are naturally led to suppose, Cranmer held,

pleasure, even our good will itself, or our inclination to accept the divine offer of grace, must, in the first instance, proceed from God. Whence, no doubt, a Calvinist may very plausibly urge: that, if *all* had this good will given to them, *all* would equally accept the divine offer of grace. I can only say, that to draw the precise line between Manichèism and Semi-Pelagianism may probably exceed the wit of man. For my own part, I freely confess my inability, though fully satisfied that the line really exists. Perhaps Melancthon comes as near to the mark, as can be accomplished by human intellect.

with Melancthon, that Election and Justification have each the same CAUSE: it will be clear, that, in pronouncing the Elect to be *justified* FREELY, the Seventeenth Article also pronounces them to be *elected* FREELY.

But, if, in conformity with the views of Melancthon, the Seventeenth Article pronounces them to be *elected* FREELY; it both rejects, in terms, the CAUSATION of *Human Merit;* and asserts, in terms, the CAUSATION of *Free and Sovereign Grace.*

(2.) Of course, I admit, that this evidence from the Seventeenth Article is purely hypothetical; resting upon the supposition, that Cranmer, like Melancthon, held the identity of the CAUSE of Election and the CAUSE of Justification: but yet I conceive it to be no contemptible evidence; because, with the conclusion involved in it, agrees the unvarying general tenor of the authorised documents of the Church of England.

The entire analogy of the Doctrinal System of that Church, as alike exhibited in her Articles and in her Homilies and in her Liturgy, stands directly opposed to the clementising or arminianising notion: that *Men's Foreseen Merit* is the moving CAUSE of his Election.

Hence, altogether and most effectually, we are precluded from entertaining the thought: that that most unscriptural notion could ever have been held by Cranmer and the reforming English Bishops his associates.

(3.) I may add yet another consideration: which, for other purposes, I have already thought it necessary to insist upon.

The notion, that *Man's Foreseen Merit is the moving* CAUSE *of his Election*, is incompatible with that IDEALITY of Election, which exhibits it, as being *An Election of certain indi-*

viduals, out of the great mass of mankind, into the pale of the visible Church Catholic.

For the joint adoption of *that* IDEALITY and of *that* CAUSATION involves a palpable contradiction: because, if none were elected into the Church, save those whose Merit and Righteousness were foreseen of God, it is quite clear that none could have been seen finally existing in the Church save the Meritorious and the Righteous; a circumstance, by every day's matter of fact, unhappily forbidden to be allowed.

Therefore it is scarcely probable, that Cranmer and his associates, assisted as they were by the wisdom of Melancthon, should have jointly adopted a Scheme of IDEALITY and a Scheme of CAUSATION, which, though hastily and incautiously taken up by some of the ancients, they could with difficulty avoid perceiving to be altogether irreconcileable.

(4.) But, though, so far as I am aware, the Church of England, in so many words, no where explicitly defines the moving CAUSE of Election: she, nevertheless, employs language, which essentially disagrees with the fancy; that Election CAUSALLY rests upon *God's Prevision of Human Merit or Righteousness.*

We are monished and warned: that, if WE WHICH ARE THE CHOSEN VINEYARD OF GOD *bring not forth good grapes, that is to say, good works that may be delectable and pleasant in his sight, when he looketh for them; but rather bring forth wild grapes, that is to say, sour works, unsavoury and unfruitful: then will he pluck away all defence; and suffer grievous plagues of famine, battle, dearth, and death, to light upon us. Finally, if these serve not, he will let us lie waste, he will give us over, he will turn away from us, he will dig and delve no more about us, he will let us alone and suffer us*

*to bring forth even such fruit as we will; to bring forth brambles, briers, and thorns, all naughtiness, all vice, and that so abundantly, that they shall clean overgrow us, choke, strangle, and utterly destroy us**.

Here it is presumed: that certain members of God's Chosen Vineyard, or certain of those individuals who have been elected into God's visible Church, *may* very possibly not bring forth good grapes or good works, but *may* very possibly bring forth wild grapes or evil works.

Nor does this presumption, in regard to certain of the declared Elect, respect merely a temporary continuance in evil, with an assured final conversion or restoration to that which is good: the English Church, we see, goes on distinctly to pronounce, that they *may* incorrigibly persevere in sin to the very end of their lives, and thus, through their utter unfitness for the enjoyments and occupations of heaven, *may* at length perish everlastingly.

Such being the judgment of the English Church, concerning the possibility of character in many of the very Elect themselves; it is clear, that she can never have deemed *The Merit or the Righteousness or the Fitness of these avowed Unworthy and Unrighteous and Unfit Individuals* to have been the moving CAUSE of their Election: for a Scheme of this description is neither more nor less, than a flat contradiction in terms.

But, if the English Church thus plainly rejects the notion, the *The Foreseen Merits of the Elect* are the moving CAUSE of their Election: it is difficult to conceive, what *other* CAUSE she would be thought to assign, than the primitively received CAUSE; namely, *God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure expressed in his promises as they be generically set forth in*

* Homil. of Falling from God, part. ii. Homil. p. 69, 70.

Holy Scripture, or *God's Free and Sovereign Grace operating in and through our Saviour Christ.*

We may, in short, safely, I think, conclude: that, with Melancthon, she holds the CAUSE of Justification and the CAUSE of Election to be one and the same; or, in other words, that she holds the moving CAUSE of Election to be, not *Our own Foreseen Merits or Righteousness*, but *The Free and Sovereign Grace of God in Christ our Redeemer.*

CHAPTER X.

THE RATIONALE OR PRINCIPLE OF ECCLESIASTICAL INDIVIDUAL ELECTION.

When St. Paul, as we have seen, very distinctly propounded both the IDEALITY and the CAUSATION of God's decree of Election: he himself was conscious of the objection, which, on the score of its exhibiting a process of injustice, would forthwith be made to the doctrine. Still, however, he silences, rather than answers, the objection. For, with the awful dogmatism of conscious inspiration, he refers such a Scheme altogether to the inscrutable Wisdom and Pleasure of God: and there, with a pointed rebuke of the vain presumptuousness of the objector, he is humbly and dutifully content to leave the matter.

Hence, I apprehend, *we* are bound to imitate the example which he has set us.

Doubtless, it may still be asked, as it was asked of old: WHY does a just God elect *some* individuals into the privileges and advantages of his Church; while *other* individuals he does not so elect? WHY is *one* assemblage of individuals chosen; while *another* assemblage of individuals is pretermitted? WHY was the individual persecutor Paul elected; and the individual persecutor Caiaphas, not elected? WHY has God's choice fallen upon the collective individuals of Britain or of Sweden or of Denmark or of Holland; rather than upon the collective individuals of China or Japan or Arabia or Hindostan?

The objection, under its present form of catechising, be it observed, is an objection, not merely to an *opinion*, but to a *fact*.

Dissatisfied we may, peradventure, be: but the stubbornness of a *fact* yields not to human dissatisfaction.

The *fact* we know: the interior mysteries of God's counsels we do *not* know*.

This, at least, is clear. If the Scheme of *An Election of certain individuals into the Church* were, in God's Wisdom and Pleasure, to be *at all* adopted: some *must* be chosen; and others *must* be pretermitted. Now, let who might be chosen, the question would equally, in all cases, arise: WHY *this* individual or *this* collection of individuals; rather than *that* individual or *that* collection of individuals? The objector, who at present asks, WHY Paul was chosen rather than Caiaphas, or WHY the collective members of the British Nation rather than the collective members of the Chinese Nation: might, had matters been reversed, have equally asked; WHY Caiaphas was preferred to Paul, and WHY the individuals of China were favoured rather than the individuals of Britain?

I give this obvious reply to such a system of idle questioning, purely to shew its utter mingled vanity and presumption. The *point* of Discrimination itself; for it were folly to deny the palpable *fact* of Discrimination: we must, like the wise Apostle, be content to leave with the Sovereign Pleasure of an inscrutable, though assuredly all-just, Divinity.

Yet, while from Scripture we thus assign *God's Supreme Will* as the sole moving CAUSE of Ecclesiastical Individual

* As our Seventeenth Article, in its original form, well expresses the idea: *Though the decrees of Predestination be unknown to us, yet must we receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generically set forth to us in Holy Scripture.*

Election: we may perhaps, with all fitting humility and with an honest wish to promote the divine glory, be permitted, cautiously and reverently, to inquire into the RATIONALE or PRINCIPLE of the present remarkable, though as a *fact* indisputable, dispensation.

If such language may be allowed me, I venture to think: that the dispensation before us is, in a manner, *forced* upon God, by the wickedness and perverseness of fallen man; forced, that is, upon a *merciful* God, who wills and purposes the restoration and salvation of our apostate race: so that, in truth, unless the Deity ceased to be a *moral* governor of the universe, and unless he determined to bind his whole intellectual creation upon earth in the adamantine chain of a fatal *necessity*; matters *could not* have been otherwise, than what we actually *find* them to have been and what indeed we may *still* observe them to be.

I. To develop my view of this subject, nothing more is necessary, than simply to follow the history of man from the beginning.

1. After the fall, God immediately afforded, to the *whole* then existing human race, the opportunity of a recovery, by forming them into a Church under the prophetic promise, that *The seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent:* and, into this Church, were duly and successively brought the two brothers Cain and Abel with their respective wives or sisters.

Here, we may observe, there was *no* election of some out of others: for the *Earliest Church* and *All Mankind* were exactly commensurate.

2. But this state of things did not long continue: and it was broken in upon, not by any arbitrary disposition of God, but by the wickedness of an individual and his descendants.

After the murderous Apostasy of Cain, a Church was, for

the first time, elected, out of the mass of mankind, in the persons of Seth and his posterity: and the object of such Election was, not to exclude all others from salvation, but to preserve the knowledge and worship of the true God through the promised mediator Christ, and thus to hold out universally the means of grace to those who should be desirous of pardon and reconciliation.

3. In the lapse of years, Apostasy so thinned this primeval Church, and wickedness to so appalling an extent spread abroad, that, save eight individuals, the whole race of mankind were destroyed by the waters of the deluge.

The consequence was, that the new world, like the old world, commenced with a Church, from which (save as respected the antediluvian apostates) Election was altogether excluded, and within which was once more comprehended the *entire* human race.

4. But, as time rolled on, the wickedness of man yet again, if we may so speak, *compelled* the righteous and merciful governor of the universe to resort to the process of discriminating Election.

The Apostasy at Babel, that germ and nucleus of the whole harmonising Scheme of Pagan Mythologic Idolatry, was carried far and wide, over the whole world, by those of the Dispersion*: and all definite knowledge, both of God and of a promised Saviour, would soon have been lost in the midst of a wild though commemorative superstition, had not the Lord been pleased to elect, into a new Church, first Abraham and his family both out of the house of his father Terah and out of the great mass of the apostate Gentiles, next Isaac and his family out of the house of Abraham, and lastly Jacob and his family out of the house of Isaac.

These successively chosen individuals were the rudiments

* See my Origin of Pagan Idolatry, book vi.

of the Levitical Church: and, from the days of Abraham down to the manifestation of Christ, ALL the members of that Church, whether *personally* they benefitted by this privilege of Election, or whether *personally* they abused it, were constantly spoken of and collectively described, as *A People, by the Sovereign Pleasure of God, and not for any Merits or peculiar fitness of their own, chosen out of the great mass of corrupt mankind.*

Yet, though privileged above the other descendants of Noah, they were so privileged, not for their own advantage *exclusively*, but for the advantage of *all mankind.* As they were elected of God in Christ, so they preserved the knowledge of God in Christ: and, from time to time, in the course of the divine providence, they shed a light, however dim and imperfect, into the dark recesses and into the gloomy adyta of Paganism.

5. In the day of the Advent of the Messiah, this Church, nevertheless, had become effete: and a new Election, into a better and more efficient Church, was the next step in the progress of God's counsels.

That Election is the subject of the apostolic phraseology, as the *parallel* Election of the Levitical Church had been the subject of the Israelitic phraseology. Its *object* was the reverse of *exclusion*: for, in truth, its *object* was the most universal *inclusion.* Yet, in *actuality*, though many were called, few were chosen. First, individuals, out of various nations, were elected. Next, individual Election virtually swelled out into national Election. Invariably, the *design* was, that all should come to the knowledge of God and be saved: but, in *practice*, while some have been elected into the Church, others, amounting to whole nations, have been pretermitted, and have thus been effectively excluded.

II. Now this process, which has continued from the fall

of man down to the present hour, and which will continue until the number of God's Elect shall be accomplished, is, in reality, nothing more than the inevitable result of a supreme government, at once moral in its principle of administration, and merciful in its will and intention and purpose.

Certainly, had it *suited* the nature of a moral government exercised over intellectual and responsible beings, the Lord *might* have forcibly constrained the whole race of mankind to be his obedient people: but, had such a plan of *Fatal Necessity* been adopted, the idea of a *moral* government must have been relinquished; for the idea of *Irresistible Constraint*, and the idea of *Laudable Obedience*, are incompatible and irreconcileable*.

Mankind, therefore, having corrupted themselves, because, as the Apostle speaks, they did not like to retain God in their knowledge; nothing was *morally* left, save to choose a succession of individuals and of communities, who, privileged themselves by a providential enjoyment of the light of God's countenance, should hold up, to the entire world out of which they had been elected, the beacon of divine truth,

* Οὐκοῦν, εἰ, ἀῤῥήτῳ τινὶ καὶ θεοπρεπεστάτῳ δυνάμει καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ χρώμενος, μετεκόμισε τὸν ἑκάστου νοῦν εἰς ἀγαθουργίας, καὶ δυσεξίτητον αὐτῷ καὶ οὐχ ἑκοντὶ λοιπὸν ἐτίθει τὸ ἀγαθὸν, γνώμης μὲν οὖν οὐκέτι τὸ χρῆμα καρπὸς, οὔτε μὴν ἐπαίνων ἄξιον, ἀνάγκης δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ ἀβουλήτου πλεονεξίας. Εἶτα τίνα τρόπον μώμου καὶ γραφῆς ἀπαλλάξομεν τὸν δημιουργὸν, ἐφέντα μὲν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ταῖς τῶν ἰδίων θελημάτων ὁρμαῖς ἡνιοχεῖσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὑποζεύξαντα δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο περιτροπαῖς ἀναγκαίαις, καὶ οἷον τισὶ πλεονεξίαις ἀφύκτοις ἐγκαταδέοντα, πρὸς γε τὸ δεῖν ἀποπεραίνειν εὖ μάλα τὸ ἀρέσκον αὐτῷ ;—Ἔδει δὴ οὖν, οὐκ ἠναγκασμένως, πειθοῖ δὲ μᾶλλον, μεταβιβάσαι πρὸς τὸ εὐήνιον τοὺς τῶν ἱερῶν σπουδασμάτων ὀλιγωρήσαντας, καὶ μονονουχὶ σκληρὸν καὶ ἀγέρωχον ἀντανιστάντας Θεῷ τὸν τῆσ ἑαυτῶν διανοίας αὐχένα. Cyril. Alex. cont. Julian. lib. viii. p. 285, 286.

in order that the boundaries of the Church might experience a perpetual enlargement.

Persons, thus happily circumstanced, are a chosen generation and a royal priesthood. They are, if we may so speak, a sort of Clergy to the entire unbelieving world: and, as it is their privilege to profit by their own knowledge of the truth; so it is their duty to let their light shine before men, that they may see their good works and glorify their Father which is in heaven.

Election, in short, as it is specified in Scripture and as it was understood by the Primitive Church, confers, no doubt, high and special advantages upon the Chosen People of God: for, in the course of the divine providence, without any particular merit or fitness on their own parts, they are elected into the Church Catholic, in order that, obeying the heavenly call, they may, through the medium of faith and holiness, attain to everlasting life. But the ultimate END of their Election, or the RATIONALE of the whole plan of divine Grace, is, if I mistake not, THE PRESERVATION OF SOUND RELIGION AND ITS WIDEST POSSIBLE DIFFUSION TO THE VERY ENDS OF THE EARTH. God will *allure;* and, by the reasonable persuasion of his free Spirit, will *influence:* but, consistently with his Scheme of *Moral Government*, he will not violently and irresistibly *constrain**. The comparatively few are

* Quoniam injustè dominabatur nobis apostasia, et cum natura essemus Dei Omnipotentis, alienavit nos contra naturam, suos proprios faciens discipulos, potens in omnibus Dei Verbum: et, non deficiens in sua justitia, justè etiam adversus ipsam conversus est apostasiam, ea quæ sunt sua redimens ab eo; non cum vi, quemadmodum illa initio dominabatur nostri, ea quæ non erant sua insatiabiliter rapiens: sed secundum suadelam, quemadmodum decebat Deum suadentem et non vim inferentem accipere quæ vellet, ut neque quod est justum confringeretur, neque antiqua plasmatio Dei deperiret. Iren. adv. hær. lib. v. c. 1. p. 317.

elected, not in order that the many may be fatally excluded, but in order that the many, learning righteousness from God's Chosen People, may gradually and finally be included. *We will go with you*, it is foretold of the language of the last period: *for we have heard, that God is with you**. Consistently with the notion of a *moral* government, it may be doubted, whether, for the ultimate reclamation of lost mankind, any other plan, than that of *An Ecclesiastical Election*, could, in the very nature of things, have been adopted.

III. As the Primitive Church, in IDEALITY and in CAUSATION, taught the doctrine of *An Ecclesiastical Individual Election through Grace according to the Sovereign Will and Pleasure of God*, under the aspect of its being the doctrine intended by the well known scriptural phraseology employed throughout the New Testament: so we may, I think, in the writings of more than one of the ancient Fathers, distinctly trace a knowledge of what I deem its true RATIONALE OR PRINCIPLE.

1. Thus, for instance, the venerable Irenèus speaks of a successive Election of Patriarchs and of Churches, out of the great mass of a corrupt and unbelieving world, for their own spiritual benefit indeed, but still for the grand and palmary purpose of preserving sound religion from utter extinction and of thus finally illuminating all mankind†.

* Zechar. viii. 23.

† Quem igitur illi Dominum præconabant incredulis, hunc Christus tradidit his qui obediunt sibi: et qui priores, sive primum, per servilem legis dationem, vocaverat Deus; hic posteriores, sive postea, per adoptionem assumpsit. Plantavit enim Deus Vineam Humani Generis, primo quidem per plasmationem Adæ et *Electionem Patrum:* tradidit autem colonis per eam legis dationem quæ est per Moysen. Sepem autem circumdedit; id est, circumterminavit eorum culturam: et turrim ædificavit. *Hierusalem elegit:* et torcular fodit. Receptaculum pro-

This is precisely my own view of the matter: and, since he in no wise delivers his sentiments as if they were at all peculiar to himself, or as if they constituted any new discovery of his own; we may, I think, fairly conclude, that this eminent pupil of St. John's disciple Polycarp stated nothing more than the general received doctrine of the early Church Catholic.

2. Accordingly, the outlines of the same theory may be traced also in the writings of Justin Martyr.

This eminent person tells us: that the Gentiles, who had been elected into the Church, were the people promised to Abraham; when God called him forth from an unholy world, and entered into covenant with him, and foretold that he should be the father of many nations. Whence he views

phetici Spiritûs præparavit: et sic prophetas misit, antequam esset in Babylonem transmigratio. Et, post transmigrationem, alios iterum plures quam priores, expetentes fructus.—Non credentibus autem illis, novissimè Filium suum misit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum: quem, cum occidissent mali coloni, projecerunt extra vineam. Quapropter et tradidit eam Dominus Deus non jam circumvallatam, sed expansam in universum mundum, aliis colonis reddentibus fructus temporibus suis, *turre electionis exaltata ubique et speciosa:* ubique enim præclara est Ecclesia, et ubique circumfossum torcular; ubique enim sunt, qui suscipiunt Spiritum. Quoniam enim *Filium Dei reprobaverunt*, et ejecerunt eum, cum eum occidissent, extra vineam: justè *reprobavit eos Deus*, et extra vineam existentibus gentibus dedit fructificationem culturæ.—Sed, quoniam et, *patriarchas qui elegit et nos*, idem est Verbum Dei, et illos semper visitans per propheticum Spiritum, et nos qui undique convocati sumus per suum adventum, super ea quæ dicta sunt, verè hæc dicebat: *Multi ab oriente et occasu venient, et recumbent cum Abraham et Isaac et Jacob in regno coelorum; filii autem regni ibunt in tenebras exteriores, ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium.* Si igitur hi, qui, per præconium Apostolorum ejus, ab oriente et occidente, credentes in eum, cum Abraham et Isaac et Jacob in regno coelorum recumbent, participantes cum eis epulationem: unus et idem Deus ostenditur, *qui elegit quidem patriarchas, visitavit vero populum, gentes vero advocavit.* Iren. adv. hær. lib. iv. c. 70. p. 301, 302, 305.

the call of Abraham, as having an immediate reference to the future vocation of the Gentiles: because it prepares the way for their imitation of the great spiritual parent of the faithful, in coming out from the evil polity in which they originally lived, and in thus being made heirs of the figurative land of promise*.

3. A similar estimate of the matter is taken likewise by Cyril of Alexandria.

After following at considerable length much the same train of reasoning as that adopted by Irenèus, he briefly develops his principle in this assertion.

The Election of the Hebrews is the Calling of the Gentiles†.

4. On the same grounds, Augustine spiritualises the prophecy, respecting Jacob and Esau, that the elder should serve the younger.

The elder brother represents the whole body of the Jews: the younger brother represents the whole body of the converted Gentiles.

* Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ μόνον λαὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαὸς ἅγιος, ἐσμὲν, ὡς ἐδείξαμεν ἤδη· Καὶ καλέσουσιν αὐτὸν λαὸν ἅγιον, λελυτρωμένον ὑπὸ Κυρίου· Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος δῆμος ἐσμὲν·—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν. Ἰδοὺ, Θεὸς εἰμι, φησὶ, τῷ ἔθνει, οἳ οὐκ ἐπεκαλέσαντο τὸ ὄνομα μου. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἔθνος, ὁ πάλαι τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὁ Θεὸς ὑπέσχετο, καὶ πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν θήσειν ἐπηγγείλατο.—Τί οὖν πλέον ἐνθάδε ὁ Χριστὸς χαρίζεται τῷ Ἀβραὰμ; Ὅτι, διὰ τῆς ὁμοίας κλήσεως, φωνῇ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν, εἰπὼν ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐν ᾗ ὤκει· καὶ ἡμᾶς δὲ ἅπαντας, δι' ἐκείνης τῆς φωνῆς, ἐκάλεσε· καὶ ἐξήλθομεν ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἐν ᾗ ἐζῶμεν, κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς γῆς οἰκητόρων κακῶς ζῶντες· καὶ, σὺν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, τὴν ἁγίαν κληρονομήσομεν γῆν, εἰς τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα τὴν κληρονομίαν ληψόμενοι, τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν πίστιν ὄντες. Just. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 272.

† Ὥστε καὶ ἐθνῶν κλῆσιν εἶναι τῶν Ἑβραίων τὴν πρόσληψιν. Cyril. cont. Julian. lib. iii. p. 110. See Ibid. p. 109–112.

Now the elder serves the younger, when he is known to carry throughout the world the sacred books of God's Law for the instruction of all the nations*.

5. To a similar effect, speaks also Athanasius.

The Law was not on account of the Jews alone: nor, on account of them alone, were the prophets sent; for, truly, to the Jews were they sent, and by the Jews were they persecuted. But, of the whole world, in regard to the knowledge of God and the due regulation of the soul, they were the sacred instructors†.

6. Equally distinct and precise is the language of Theodoret.

God appointed the nation of the Jews to be the instructor of all nations in the knowledge of the Deity. And, as, for the overcharge of that nation, he one while elected Moses,

* Quod autem dictum est; *Populus populum superabit, et major serviet minori:* secundum literam, in Esau vel in Jacob, non videmus impletum. Non enim corporaliter beato Jacobo Esau servisse commemorat Scriptura. Quomodo ergo hoc oporteat intelligi, aut qualiter major populus minori serviat, spiritaliter debemus intelligere. Nisi enim fieret, non hic Sancta Scriptura commemoraret. Quomodo ergo populus major serviat minori, qui hoc diligenter attendit, in Christianis vel in Judæis agnoscit. Major enim et senior populus Judæorum, juniori, id est, populo Christiano, servire probatur; dum, per totum mundum, libros divinæ legis, ad instructionem omnium gentium, portare cognoscitur.—Hoc ordine, major populus minori servire cognoscitur; dum etiam, per illorum libros, ad credendum in Christo gentium populus invitatur. August. in feria tertia post secund. dominic. in Quadrages. serm. ii. Oper. vol. x. p. 243.

† Τῶν εἰδώλων ἡ θρησκεία ἀθεότης ἐστι, καὶ πάσης ἀσεβείας μεστή. Ἐξὸν δὲ ἦν αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὸν νόμον ἐγνωκότας, παύσασθαι πάσης παρανομίας, καὶ τὸν κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆσαι βίον. Οὐδὲ γὰρ, διὰ Ἰουδαίους μόνους, ὁ νόμος ἦν, οὐδὲ, δι' αὐτοὺς μόνους, οἱ προφῆται ἐπέμποντο· ἀλλὰ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους μὲν ἐπέμποντο, καὶ παρὰ Ἰουδαίων ἐδιώκοντο. Πάσης δὲ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἦσαν διδασκάλιον ἱερὸν τῆς περὶ Θεοῦ γνώσεως καὶ τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν πολιτείας. Athan de Incarn. Verb. Oper. vol. i. p. 46.

another while Joshua, another while Samuel, and another while one or other of the prophets; and thence, through the religious philosophising of one man, benefitted all who were that single individual's countrymen: so, through the single nation of Israel, he called, to the joint-fellowship of piety, all nations, inasmuch as all partake of the same common nature.*

IV. Here, then, we may close our discussion; assured, that the moral governor of the earth, in the purpose and in the accomplishment of his decree of Election, acts both wisely and righteously.

Meanwhile we must never forget: that the ascertainment of religious truth is of small profit unless it leads to a holy religious practice. Whatever may be the destiny of others, *we*, at least, have been elected into the pale of Christ's Uni-

* Τῶν γὰρ ἐθνῶν ἁπάντων τοῦτο τὸ ἔθνος θεογνωσίας ἐχειροτόνει διδάσκαλον. Καὶ, καθάπερ εἰς τοῦδε τοῦ ἔθνους ἐπιμέλειαν, νῦν μὲν ἐξελέξατο τὸν Μωϋσῆν, νῦν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πάλιν τὸν Σαμουὴλ, ἄλλοτε δὲ ἄλλον τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου φιλοσοφίαν ἀσκοῦντος, ἅπαντας εὐεργέτει τοὺς ὁμοφύλους· οὕτω, δι' ἑνὸς ἔθνους τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, τὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντα φύσιν, εἰς τὴν εὐσεβείας κοινωνίαν ἐκάλει. Theodor. de Provid. serm. x. p. 454.

Much the same view of this question is taken in the Confession of the Saxon Churches, as drawn up by Melancthon to be presented in the year 1551 to the Council of Trent.

Vult Deus intelligi, genus humanum non casu nasci, sed a Deo conditum esse: et conditum, non ad æternum exitium, sed ut colligat sibi in genere humano Ecclesiam, cui in omni æternitate communicet suam sapientiam, bonitatem, et lætitiam. Et vult conspici Filium, propter quem, et per quem, inenarrabili sapientia et immensa misericordia, hanc miseram naturam hominum restituit. Ideo SEMPER in genere humano coetum esse voluit, cui tradidit doctrinam de Filio, et in quo Filius ipse instituit et conservavit ministerium custodiendæ et propagandæ ejus doctrinæ, per quam et efficax fuit, est, et erit. Et multos ad se convertit, sicut manifestè inquit Paulus: *Evangelium est potentia Dei, ad salutem omni credenti.* Confess. Saxon. sect. xii. Syllog. Confess. p. 272.

versal Church. *Our* business, therefore, is: to be thankful for the privileges which we enjoy, to improve through grace the mercies of grace, to take heed lest we fall away to final impenitency, to labour in the holy task of making our Calling and Election sure, and to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling since it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things, which are revealed, belong unto us and to our children for ever; that we may do all the words of this Law.*

* Deut. xxix. 29.

APPENDIX.

CANONES CONCILII ARAUSICANI, A LEONE PAPA, EJUS NOMINIS PRIMO, INDICTI. A.D. 441.

I. Si quis, per offensam prævaricationis Adæ, non totum, id est, secundum corpus et animam, in deterius dicit hominem commutatum; sed, anima libertate illæsa durante, corpus tantummodo corruptioni credit obnoxium, Pelagii errore deceptus, adversatur Scripturæ dicenti: *Anima, quæ peccaverit, ipsa morietur;* et, *Nescitis, quoniam cui exhibetis vos servos ad obediendum, servi estis ejus cui obeditis?* et, *A quo quis superatur, ejus et servus addicitur.*

II. Si quis soli Adæ prævaricationem suam, non et ejus propagini, asserit nocuisse, aut certè mortem tantum corporis, quæ poena peccati est, non autem et peccatum, quod mors est animæ, per unum hominem in omne genus humanum transisse testatur, injustitiam Deo dabit, contradicens Apostolo dicenti: *Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum, et per peccatum mors in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt.*

III. Si quis invocatione humana gratiam Dei dicit posse conferri, non autem ipsam gratiam facere ut invocetur a nobis, contradicit Esaiæ prophetæ vel Apostolo idem dicenti: *Inventus sum a non quærentibus me; palam apparui his, qui me non interrogabant.*

IV. Si quis, ut a peccato purgemur, voluntatem nostram Deum expectare contendit, non autem ut etiam purgari velimus per Sancti Spiritus infusionem et operationem in nobis fieri confitetur, resistit ipsi Spiritui Sancto, per Salamonem dicenti; *Præparatur voluntas a Domino:* et Apostolo salubriter prædicanti; *Deus est, qui operatur in nobis et velle et perficere pro bona voluntate.*

V. Si quis, sicut augmentum, ita etiam initium, fidei, ipsumque credulitatis affectum, quo in eum credimus qui justificat impium, et ad

regenerationem baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratiæ donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritûs Sancti corrigentem voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, sed naturaliter nobis inesse dicit, apostolicis dogmatibus adversarius approbatur, beato Paulo dicente ; *Confidimus, quia, qui coepit in vobis bonum opus, perficiet usque in diem Domini nostri Jesu Christi :* et illud ; *Vobis datum est pro Christo, non solum ut in eum credatis, sed etiam ut pro illo patiamini :* et ; *Gratia salvi facti estis per fidem, non ex vobis, Dei enim donum est.* Qui enim fidem, qua in Deum credimus, dicunt esse naturalem, omnes eos, qui ab Ecclesia Christi alieni sunt, quodammodo fideles esse definiunt.

VI. Si quis, sine gratia Dei, credentibus, volentibus, desiderantibus, conantibus, laborantibus, vigilantibus, studentibus, petentibus, quærentibus, pulsantibus, nobis, misericordiam dicit conferri divinitus, non autem ut credamus, velimus, vel hæc omnia sicut oportet agere valeamus, per infusionem et inspirationem Sancti Spiritûs in nobis fieri, confitetur, et aut humilitati aut obedientiæ humanæ subjungit gratiæ adjutorium, nec ut obedientes et humiles simus ipsius gratiæ donum esse consentit, resistit Apostolo dicenti : *Quid habes, quod non accepisti ?* et, *Gratia Dei sum id, quod sum.*

VII. Si quis, per naturæ vigorem, bonum aliquod, quod ad salutem pertinet vitæ æternæ, cogitare ut expedit, aut eligere, sive salutari, id est, evangelicæ prædicationi, consentire posse confirmat, absque illuminatione et inspiratione Spiritûs Sancti, qui dat omnibus suavitatem in consentiendo et credendo veritati, hæretico fallitur spiritu, non intelligens vocem Dei, in Evangelio dicentis ; *Sine me nihil potestis facere :* et illud Apostoli : *Non quod idonei sumus cogitare aliquid a nobis, quasi ex nobis, sed sufficientia nostra ex Deo est.*

VIII. Si quis, alios misericordia, alios vero per liberum arbitrium (quod, in omnibus, qui de prævaricatione primi hominis nati sunt, constat esse vitiatum), ad gratiam baptismi posse venire contendit, a recta fide probatur alienus. Is enim non omnium liberum arbitrium per peccatum primi hominis asserit infirmatum, aut certè ita læsum putat, ut tamen quidam valeant, sine revelatione Dei, mysterium salutis æternæ per semetipsos conquirere. Quod quam sit contrarium, ipse Dominus probat : qui, non aliquos, sed neminem, ad se posse venire testatur, nisi quem Pater attraxerit. Sicut et Petro dicit : *Beatus es, Simon Bariona ; quia caro et sanguis non revelavit tibi, sed Pater meus*

qui in coelis est. Et Apostolus: *Nemo potest dicere Dominum Jesum Christum, nisi in Spiritu Sancto.*

IX. Divini est muneris, cum et rectè cogitamus, et pedes nostros a falsitate et injustitia tenemus. Quoties enim bona agimus, Deus in nobis atque nobiscum, ut operemur, operatur.

X. Adjutorium Dei etiam renatis ac sanctis semper est implorandum, ut, ad finem bonum pervenire, vel in bono, possint, opere perdurare.

XI. Nemo quicquam Domino rectè voverit, nisi ab illo acceperit, sicut legitur: *Quæ de manu tua accepimus, damus tibi.*

XII. Tales nos amat Deus, quales futuri sumus ipsius dono, non quales sumus nostro merito.

XIII. Arbitrium voluntatis in primo homine infirmatum, nisi per gratiam baptismi, non potest reparari. Quod amissum, uni, a quo potuit dari, non potest reddi. Unde ipsa Veritas dicit: *Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc verè liberi eritis.*

XIV. Nullus miser de quantacunque miseria liberatur, nisi qui Dei misericordia prævenitur, sicut dicit Psalmista; *Cito anticipet nos misericordia tua, Domine:* et illud; *Deus meus, misericordia ejus, præveniet me.*

XV. Ab eo, quod formavit Deus, mutatur Adam, sed in pejus, per iniquitatem suam: ab eo, quod operata est iniquitas, mutatur fidelis, sed in melius, per gratiam Dei. Illa ergo mutatio fuit prævaricatoris primi: hæc, secundum Psalmistam, *mutatio dexteræ Excelsi.*

XVI. Nemo ex eo, quod videtur habere, glorietur, tanquam non acceperit, aut ideo se putet accepisse, quia litera extrinsecus, vel ut legeretur apparuit, vel ut audiretur insonuit. Nam, sicut Apostolus dicit: *Si per legem justitia, ergo Christus gratis mortuus est:* porro autem, si non gratis mortuus est, *ascendens in altum, captivam duxit captivitatem, dedit dona hominibus.* Inde habet, quicunque habet. Quisquis autem inde se habere negat, aut verè non habet, aut id quod habet auferetur ab eo.

XVII. Fortitudinem Gentilium mundana cupiditas, fortitudinem Christianorum Dei *charitas*, facit: *quæ diffusa est in cordibus nostris*, non per voluntatis arbitrium, sed *per Spiritum Sanctum, qui datus est nobis*, nullis meritis gratiam prævenientibus.

XVIII. Debetur merces bonis operibus, si fiant: sed gratia, quæ non debetur, præcedit, ut fiant.

XIX. Natura humana, etiam si in illa integritate, in qua est condita, permaneret, nullo modo seipsam, Creatore suo non adjuvante, servaret.

Unde, cum, sine gratia Dei, salutem non possit custodire quam accepit: quomodo, sine Dei gratia, poterit reparare quod perdidit?

XX. Multa in homine bona fiunt, quæ non facit homo. Nulla vero facit homo bona, quæ non Deus præstet, ut faciat homo.

XXI. Sicut eis, qui, volentes in Lege justificari, a gratia exciderunt, verissimè dicit Apostolus; *Si ex Lege justitia est, ergo Christus gratis mortuus est:* sic et his, qui gratiam, quam commendat et percipit fides Christi, putant esse naturam, verissimè dicitur; *Si ex natura justitia, ergo Christus gratis mortuus est*, jam hic enim erat Lex et non justificabat, jam hic erat et natura et non justificabat. Ideo Christus non gratis mortuus est: ut et Lex per illum impleretur, qui dixit, *Non veni Legem solvere, sed adimplere;* et natura, per Adam perdita, per illum repararetur, qui dixit, venisse se quærere et salvare quod perierat.

XXII. Nemo habet de suo, nisi mendacium et peccatum. Si quid autem habet homo veritatis atque justitiæ, ab illo fonte est, quem debemus sitire in hac eremo, ut, ex eo quasi guttis quibusdam inrorati, non deficiamus in via.

XXIII. Suam voluntatem homines faciunt, non Dei, quando id agunt quod Deo displicet. Quando autem ita faciunt quod volunt, ut divinæ serviant voluntati, quamvis volentes agant quod agunt, illis tamen voluntas est, a quo præparatur et jubetur quod volunt.

XXIV. Ita sunt in vite palmites, ut viti nihil conferant, sed inde accipiant unde vivant. Sic, quippe, vitis est in palmitibus, ut vitale alimentum subministret eis, non sumat ab eis. Ac, per hoc, et manentem in se habere Christum, et manere in Christo, discipulis prodest, et non Christo. Nam, præciso palmite, potest de viva radice alius pullulare. Qui autem præcisus est, non potest sine radice vivere.

XXV. Prorsus donum Dei est, diligere Deum. Ipse, ut diligeretur, dedit, qui non dilectus dilexit. Displicentes, amati sumus, ut fieret in nobis unde placeremus. Diffundit enim charitatem in cordibus nostris Spiritus Patris et Filii, quem cum Patre amamus et Filio. Ac sic, secundum suprascriptas Sanctarum Scripturarum sententias vel antiquorum Patrum definitiones, hoc Deo propitiante, et prædicare debemus et credere, quod, per peccatum primi hominis, ita inclinatum et attenuatum fuerit liberum arbitrium, ut nullus postea, aut diligere Deum sicut oportuit, aut credere in Deum, aut operari propter Deum quod bonum est, possit, nisi gratia eum et misericordia divina prævenerit. Unde, Abel justo, et Noe, et Abraham, et Isaac, et Jacob, omnique antiquorum

sanctorum multitudini, illam præclaram fidem, quam in ipsorum laudem prædicat Apostolus Paulus, non per bonum naturæ quod prius in Adam datum fuerat, sed per gratiam Dei, credimus fuisse collatam : quam gratiam, etiam post adventum Domini, omnibus qui baptizari desiderant, non in libero arbitrio habere, sed in Christi (novimus simul et credimus) largitate conferri, secundum illud quod jam supra dictum est et prædicat Paulus Apostolus, *Vobis donatum est pro Christo, non solum ut in eum credatis, sed etiam ut pro illo patiamini ;* et illud, *Deus, qui coepit in vobis bonum opus, perficiet usque in diem Domini nostri ;* et illud, *Gratia salvi facti estis per fidem, et hoc non ex vobis, Dei enim donum est ;* et quod de seipso ait Apostolus, *Misericordiam consecutus sum, ut fidelis essem* (Non dixit, *Quia eram ;* sed, *Ut essem*) ; et illud, *Quid habes, quod non accepisti ?* et illud, *Omne datum bonum, et omne donum perfectum, de sursum est, descendens a Patre luminum ;* et illud, *Nemo habet quidquam boni, nisi illud illi datum fuerit de super.* Innumerabilia sunt Sanctarum Scripturarum testimonia, quæ possint ad probandam gratiam proferri : sed, brevitatis studio, prætermissa sunt ; quia et revera, cui pauca non sufficiunt, plura non proderunt.

1. Hoc etiam, secundum fidem catholicam, credimus, quod, accepta per baptismum gratia, omnes baptizati, Christo auxiliante et coöperante, quæ ad salutem pertinent, possint et debeant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere.

2. Aliquos vero ad malum divina postestate prædestinatos esse, non solum non credimus, sed etiam, si sunt qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus.

3. Hoc etiam salubriter profitemur et credimus, quod, in omni opere bono, non nos incipimus, et postea per Dei misericordiam adjuvamur : sed ipse nobis, nullis præcedentibus bonis meritis, et fidem et amorem sui prius inspirat ; ut et baptismi sacramenta fideliter requiramus, et post baptismum cum ipsius adjutorio ea quæ sibi sunt placita implere possimus. Unde manifestissimè credendum est, quod, et illius latronis quem Dominus ad Paradisi patriam revocavit, et Cornelii centurionis ad quem angelus Domini missus est, et Zachæi qui ipsum Dominum suscipere meruit, illa tam admirabilis fides non fuit de natura, sed divinæ largitatis donum.

4. Et, quia definitionem antiquorum Patrum, nostramque quæ supra scripta est, non solum religiosis, sed etiam laicis, medicamentum esse,

et desideramus et cupimus : placuit ergo, ut etiam illustres ac magnifici viri, qui nobiscum ad præfatam festivitatem convenerunt, propria manu subscriberent.

Episcoporum nomina subscribentium.

Cæsarius : Julianus : Constantius : Cyprianus : Eucherius : Heraclius : Principius : Philagrius : Maximus : Prætextatus : Aletius : Lupercianus : Vindemialis.

Laicorum illustrium nomina subscribentium.

Petrus : Marcellinus : Felix : Liberius : Syagrius : Opilio : Pantagathus : Deodatus : Cariattho : Marcellus.

Quinto nonas Julii, Decio juniore viro clarissimo consule. A. D. 441.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

THE NEGATIVE TESTIMONY OF HISTORY IN REGARD TO THE TRUE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND PREDESTINATION.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

Since SOME doctrine of *Election* is undeniably taught in Scripture, the question is WHAT *doctrine ought to be received as the true Scriptural doctrine.* p. 19.

I. Three Schemes of exposition have been variously propounded. p. 19.—1. The *Ideality* and *Causation* of Election, according to Arminianism. p. 19.—2. The *Ideality* and *Causation* of Election, according to Nationalism. p. 20.—3. The *Ideality* and *Causation* of Election, according to Calvinism. p. 20.

II. In the case of each Scheme alike, the whole question is really a question of *Interpretation.* p. 20.

III. The proof of correctness of interpretation must be sought historically in the yet existing documents of primitive Christian Antiquity. p. 22.

IV. Such a mode of investigation is professedly favoured and recommended by the Church of England. p. 25.

CHAPTER II.

ARMINIANISM.

The *Ideality* and *Causation* of Election, according to the System of Arminianism. p. 28.

I. Respecting Predestination and Grace, the sentiments of the Re-

monstrants, anterior to the Synod of Dort, were summed up in five Articles. p. 28.

II. Arminianism, to a wide extent, has been received with approbation. p. 29.—1. If Arminianism really exhibit the mind of Scripture in regard to the doctrine of *Election*, we may expect to find it universally taught and maintained by the Primitive Church. p. 30.—2. As a System, no such Scheme can be found in the documents of Christian Antiquity. p. 31.—(1.) Its theory of *Causation* may be traced as high as Clement of Alexandria toward the close of the second century: but, before his time, no vestiges of it can be detected. p. 31.—(2.) Its theory of *Ideality* never appears in the expositions of the early ecclesiastical writers. p. 31.

III. Historical Testimony, therefore, prohibits the adoption of Arminianism. p. 32.

CHAPTER III.

NATIONALISM.

The *Ideality* and *Causation* of Election, according to the System of Nationalism. p. 33.

I. The principles of Nationalism, as developed by Mr. Locke. p. 33.

II. Some passages occur in the Works of the earliest ecclesiastical writers, which might, with sufficient plausibility, be evidentially adduced in favor of Nationalism. p. 35.—1. Clement of Rome. p. 35.—2. Irenèus. p. 36.—3. Ambrose. p. 37.

III. But these passages, when explained by other passages which also occur in the early documents of the Church, are evinced to afford nothing more than a mere *semblance* of support. p. 37.—1. Clement of Rome. p. 38.—2. Justin Martyr. p. 38.—3. Irenèus. p. 39.—4. Ambrose. p. 39.

IV. Since, therefore, the passages afford, in reality, no evidence to establish the position, that *Nationalism was the System received and delivered by the Primitive Church*, Historical Testimony prohibits the adoption of Nationalism as setting forth the genuine mind of Scripture. p. 39.

CHAPTER IV.

CALVINISM.

The *Ideality* and *Causation* of Election, according to the System of Calvinism. p. 40.

I. The order of the five Articles, under the form of which, at the Synod of Dort, the Calvinistic System was exhibited. p. 40.—1. According to God's decree of Predestination, some are elected to a certainty of eternal happiness, and others are either reprobated or preterminited to a certainty of eternal misery. p. 40.—2. The Redemption of man is confined to the Elect. p. 41.—3. Original Sin is conveyed through the propagation of a vicious nature. p. 42.—4. The Elect, in God's due time, obediently receive an Effectual Calling. p. 42.—5. Thus being effectually called, the Elect are privileged by the grace of Final Perseverance. p. 43.

II. The five Points of doctrine propounded by the five Articles. p. 43.—1. Predestination, branching out into Election and Reprobation. p. 43.—2. Particular Redemption. p. 44.—3. Original Sin. p. 44.—4. Effectual Calling. p. 44.—5. Final Perseverance. p. 44.

III. Further modification of Calvinism. p. 44.—1. Supralapsarianism. p. 44.—2. Sublapsarianism. p. 44.

II. The doctrine of *Supralapsarianism* was maintained by Calvin. p. 44.

CHAPTER V.

SEMICALVINISM.

In the mitigated Scheme of Semicalvinism, Reprobation is either studiously kept out of sight or is disguised under the name of *Preterition:* and the second Point, which propounds the Particular Redemption of the Elect only, is denied. p. 48.

I. What this Scheme gains in moderation, it loses in concinnity. p. 51.—1. When the rotundity of genuine Calvinism is invaded, the reign of doctrinal chaos commences. p. 51.—2. Reprobation is the strict and necessary correlative to Election. p. 51.—3. To say, with the Semicalvinists, that *All men may be saved if they please*, and that *There wants the will only in those who are not saved*, is mere trifling. p. 52.—3. To say, that *All are redeemed*, but that *A certain number only of the Redeemed are elected to eternal life*, is inconsistent. p. 54.—5. Baxterianism is an attempt, sorely against the will of the parties, to wed Calvinism to disguised Pelagianism. p. 55.

II. Remarks on the Scheme of Semicalvinism, as propounded by Mr. Milner. p. 56.—1. His vindication of his doctrine by the alleged example of our Anglican Church-Reformers. p. 56.—

2. His vindication of his doctrine by an asserted appeal to Scripture. p. 57.—3. His recommendation, that those, who cannot receive the Scheme of Semicalvinism, should pray that God would teach them what at present they see not. p. 58.—(1.) This recommendation unhappily confounds the moral illumination of the Holy Ghost with his intellectual illumination. p. 59.—(2.) Practical inconvenience of the plan recommended, exhibited in cases which have actually occurred. p. 61.—(3.) Conclusion. p. 65.

CHAPTER VI.

INDUCTION AND EVIDENCE.

Calvinism cannot be reasonably received without an inquiry, upon what foundation that Scheme has been erected. p. 66.

I. Calvinism is strictly a System of Induction. p. 66.—1. According to the plan of inductive reasoning adopted by Calvinists, a certain definite number of individuals is, by the sovereign will of God, elected, through the medium of holiness here, to eternal glory hereafter. p. 67.—2. Such being the case, those who are not elected to life, must be reprobated or pretermitted to death. p. 67.—3. Therefore, as God never intentionally acts in vain, Redemption can only be the Particular Redemption of the Elect. p. 67.—4. But, as all mankind are born in sin, the Elect, in order to their predestined salvation, must be, not only particularly redeemed, but also effectually called. p. 68.—5. Finally, since the Elect are chosen to a certainty of eternal life, such an Election plainly involves and requires the Perseverance of the Elect to the very end of their lives. p. 68.

II. The whole of this train of reasoning, and consequently the whole Calvinistic System, depends upon the scriptural accuracy of a proposed definition of the term *Election*. p. 68.—1. Unless some better reason, for adopting the calvinistic definition of the term *Election*, can be given, than the mere opinion of a private individual, the whole will simply amount to this: *The calvinistic doctrine of Election* MUST *be true, because an individual* THINKS *that it is true*. p. 70.—2. To allege the *mere* phraseology of Scripture, as any evidence, is nothing better than a gross *petitio principii*. p. 70.—3. What we require, and what we have a right to require, is some tangible PROOF that Calvin's interpretation of the word *Election* is, in point both of Ideality and Causation, its

true interpretation. p. 72.—4. The same demand may, of course, be justly made upon every individual Calvinist of the present day. p. 73.

CHAPTER VII.

AUGUSTINE.

If Calvinism be the mind of Scripture, it must have been well and familiarly known and received by the Catholic Church from the very beginning. p. 74.

I. In regard to his advocacy of the Scheme now denominated *Calvinism*, we cannot justly charge the Genevan Reformer with inventive innovation. p. 75.

II. The Scheme may be retrogressively traced, in well nigh unbroken succession, from Calvin in the sixteenth century, up to Augustine in the fifth century. p. 75.—1. Augustine, like Calvin, fully maintained the five Points. p. 75.—(1.) God's Sovereignty and Man's Original Sin. p. 75.—(2.) Absolute Predestination. p. 77.—(3.) Particular Redemption. p. 79.—(4.) Effectual Calling. p. 79.—(5.) Final Perseverance. p. 80.—2. In one particular only, that of *Regeneration*, there is an apparent difference between Augustine and Calvin. p. 80.—3. There is no evidence to determine, whether Augustine was a Supralapsarian or a Sublapsarian. p. 85.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE HISTORICAL VINDICATION OF HIS SYSTEM, PREFERRED BY AUGUSTINE, AND REPEATED BY CALVIN.

Though Calvinism may be traced up to Augustine in the fifth century, the question will still remain: *Whether Augustine himself was a daring innovator; or whether he propounded nothing else, than what had been the universally familiar doctrine of the Church from the very beginning.* p. 89.

I. Augustine's vindication of his System, on the score: that *He set forth no new Scheme of doctrine;* but that *He faithfully delivered to posterity, what had been actually received from antiquity.* p. 89.—1. Augustine's controversy with Pelagius and the Pelagians. p. 90.—2. The allegation made against him by the Christians of Marseilles: that, *In superfluously maintaining his own peculiar views of Election and Reprobation, he was advancing an entirely*

new System, which had never before been heard of, which had no evidential sanction from the writings of the Fathers that preceded him, and which was notoriously contrary to the received sense of the Church Catholic. p. 92.—3. Augustine's reply to the allegation. p. 94.—(1.) His attempt to enlist the Church Catholic in his cause. p. 97.—(2.) His adduction of Cyprian and Gregory-Nazianzen and Ambrose. p. 99.—4. The Council of Orange, A. D. 441. p. 104.

II. Calvin ventures not an appeal to any higher antiquity than that of Augustine, save in so far as he repeats, after his own fashion, Augustine's appeal. p. 107.—1. While, omitting Cyprian and Gregory-Nazianzen as evidently conscious of their total irrelevancy, he mentions Ambrose alone; he unfairly employs language, which would lead an unguarded reader to suppose, that Augustine claimed as his own the suffrage of *All Christian Antiquity*. p. 108.—2. By way, apparently, of exciting prejudice against the allegation of the Massilian Christians, he most inaccurately intimates: that *That allegation was preferred by* THE PELAGIANS *with whom Augustine was then engaged in controversy*. p. 108.—(1.) The very language of Augustine to the Massilian Christians shews, that he was proposing to them *a novelty*. p. 112.—(2.) He himself elsewhere confesses, that his view of *Election* was the result of his own research and discovery: whence plainly it follows, that he had not received it from his catechetical instructors under the aspect of the ancient and authorised doctrine of the Church. p. 113.

CHAPTER IX.

CLEMENT OF ROME AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

Mr. Milner, the Historian of the Church of Christ, adduces Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, as witnesses for *The Doctrinal Calvinism of the earliest Primitive Church.* p. 114.

I. The theory of Mr. Milner in regard to Primeval Doctrine, p. 114.—1. The passage, in substantiation of it, adduced by him from Clement. p. 115.—2. The passage, in substantiation of it, adduced by him from Ignatius. p. 115.

II. An examination of the effective amount of the testimony brought forward by Mr. Milner. p. 116.—1. Language of Clement. p. 117.—(1.) Inacuracy of the character, which Mr. Milner ascribes to Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians. p. 117.—(2.) Mr. Milner *assumes*, what he ought to have *proved:* that

Clement and Augustine use the word Election in the same SENSE. p. 118.—2. Language of Ignatius. p. 121.—(1.) Mr. Milner again *assumes*, what he ought to have *proved*. p. 122.—(2.) Unjust allegation preferred by Mr. Milner against those, who allow no higher origin to Calvinism than the age and authority of Augustine. p. 124.

CHAPTER X.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

A statement of the difficulty, which inevitably springs out of Mr. Milner's first theory: that *The Primitive Church from the beginning held and taught the Scheme of doctrine advocated by Augustine and Calvin*. p. 126.

I. An evident feeling of this difficulty compelled him to frame a second or subsidiary theory; which, from the admitted FACT that *Justin never explicitly owns the doctrine of Augustinian Election*, and from the additional well known FACT that *Justin was once a Platonist*, lays it down: that, *Through Justin's influence and authority, the genuine primitive doctrine of Election gradually vanished from the Church in the course of the second century; while the pelagianising notion of a Self-determining Free Will gradually usurped its place*. p. 127.

II. An examination of this second theory, which the necessity of his first theory has compelled Mr. Milner to frame and to propose. p. 129.—1. The palpable inconsistency and moral impossibility of Mr. Milner's speculation respecting Justin. p. 129.—2. Mr. Milner's mode of accounting for Justin's acknowledged silence in regard to the doctrine of *Augustinian Election*, on the plea: that *A Spirit of Philosophy produced in him notions not altogether agreeable to the genius of the Gospel*. p. 132.—3. Justin, though he never owns the doctrine of *Augustinian Election*, is not, as Mr. Milner's language would lead his readers to suppose, silent upon the topic of *Election itself*. On the contrary, he twice mentions it: and, what is fatal alike to *both* of Mr. Milner's theories, while he appears quite unconscious of any existence, either past or present, of the Calvinistic *Ideality* of Election; he familiarly, as if he were speaking the well-known ordinary sentiments of the Primitive Church, attaches to Election an *Ideality* altogether different from that which is maintained in the Calvinistic or Augustinian System. p. 134.

CHAPTER XI.

THE DOCTRINE OF FREE WILL, AS UNDERSTOOD BY JUSTIN MARTYR AND THE EARLY FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

All abstract or metaphysical discussion of the topic of *Free Will* is declined, both as foreign from the plan of the present Work, and as apparently useless and unprofitable in itself. Consequently, the discussion entered upon is purely and merely *evidential*. p. 136.

I. In the allegation, preferred by Mr. Milner against Justin, he appears to have entirely mistaken his real sentiments. p. 136.—1. Justin enters upon the subject of *Human Free Will* or of *Human Freedom of Preference* exactly five times: and, in all these various instances, he is arguing, not, with an anticipative Pelagianism, against *The necessity of preventing and assisting Grace;* but, with a just and catholic reprobation, against *The dogma of Absolute Fatalism whether Jewish or Stoical*. p. 137. 2. A confirmatory citation and exhibition of the five passages. p. 137.—3. Proof, from Justin's own express declarations, that he held *The Necessity of Divine Grace in order to man's acceptable holiness*, and consequently that he did not pelagianise by anticipation. p. 143.

II. Respecting *Human Free Will* or *Human Freedom of Preference*, the doctrine of Justin was precisely the same, as that both of his contemporary Irenèus and of his distant successor even Augustine himself. p. 144.—1. The reasoning and doctrinal principles of Irenèus. p. 144.—(1.) He maintained *Human Free Will* against the *Fatalism* of the Gnostics. p. 145.—(2.) But he also maintained *The Necessity of Divine Grace*. p. 146.—2. The maintenance of *Human Free Will* by Augustine, concurrently with *Divine Grace*, is at once carried on, against professed *Fatalism* on the one hand, and against professed *Pelagianism* on the other hand. p. 147.

III. The key to the whole matter is: that, like many other moderns, Mr. Milner has not sufficiently distinguished between *The Free Will of Spontaneous Preference* and *The Good Will of freely preferring Virtue to Vice;* while, by the more accurate ancients, this distinction was well known and carefully preserved. p. 149.—1. A collection of passages, exhibiting the sentiments of the early Fathers. p. 151.—(1.) Augustine. p. 151.—(2.) Cyril of Jerusalem. p. 152.—(3.) Athanasius. p. 152.—(4.) Cyprian. p. 153. (5.) Tertullian. p. 153.—(6.) Tatian. p. 153.—(7.) Theophilus

of Antioch. p. 154.—2. The doctrine, taught by Augustine and the ancients respecting *Human Free Will*, is precisely that which is maintained by the Reformers of the Anglican Church. p. 154.—3. Conclusion. p. 155.

CHAPTER XII.

GENERAL RESULT AND CONCLUSION.

In the way of historical testimony, the general result from the preceding inquiry is: that *Arminianism and Nationalism and Calvinism, viewed as compact and well-digested Systems, were alike unknown to the earliest Church Catholic.* Whence the conclusion is: that *Not one of those three Systems exhibits the mind of the sincere Gospel.* p. 158.

I. The principle of such a conclusion is: that, *In revealed religion, whatever is first, is true; whatever is later, is adulterate.* p. 158.

II. Remarks on the common somewhat silly profession of *A disregard of the early Fathers* and of *An abiding by the decision of Scripture alone.* p. 159.—1. The Fathers, individually, have no personal authority in the exposition of Scripture: but, as witnesses to the fact of WHAT *doctrines the Primitive Church maintained on the avowed ground that she had received them from the Apostles*, they have and must have, on the legitimate principles of historical evidence, a great and mighty authority. p. 159.—2. The childish profession before us, namely, *A resolution to abide by the decision of Scripture alone*, is, most unskilfully and illogically, confounded with *A determination to abide solely by some one individual's own private and arbitrary interpretation of Scripture.* In other words, they, who glory in making such a profession, really do neither more nor less, than confound *The Bible itself* with *A gratuitous Interpretation of the Bible.* p. 160.

III. Arminians and Nationalists do not attach that importance to their respective Systems, which Calvinists are wont to do. But the very importance thus attached to the peculiarities of Calvinism as constituting the essence of the sincere Gospel, when united with the strange and ominous want of historical testimony to prove that *It was the doctrine of the Primitive Apostolic Church*, serves only to shew the inherent weakness of its foundation. p. 162.—1. The incongruous result which springs from the often exaggerated religious importance of Calvinism. p. 162.—(1.) Unfairness of so coupling together *the doctrines of Grace* and *the peculiarities of Calvinism*, as to intimate or insinuate that the *for-*

mer cannot be embraced without the *latter*. p. 163.—(2.) We have no evidence, that the Primitive Church practically theologised in the doctrinal mode recommended by Augustine and Calvin. p. 166.—(3.) Hence the incongruous result is: that *The Primitive Church, though taught by the Apostles themselves, was ignorant of those doctrinal peculiarities, without which, according to the written decision of a zealous Calvinist, there can be, neither peace in the conscience, nor love of God, nor a conversation becoming the Gospel, nor an enjoyment of evangelical blessings and comforts*. p. 167.—2. The practical error of rating the importance of Calvinism so high, as to make the System itself absolutely essential to the happiness and satisfaction of every real Christian. p. 168.—(1.) A statement to this effect can never legitimately be made to bear upon the simple question of the *truth* or *falsehood* of a doctrine. p. 169.—(2.) The statement, however, may be met, even on the very principle which it advances: for no comfort can be derived from holding the doctrine of *Calvinistic Election*, unless the person, who holds it, can be infallibly certified that he himself individually is one of the Elect. p. 169.

BOOK II.

THE POSITIVE TESTIMONY OF HISTORY IN REGARD TO THE TRUE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND PREDESTINATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORICAL OR EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF CONTROVERSY.

Theological Controversy, on any topic, affords sure and certain evidence: that *At least two clashing Systems of opinion must have been in existence, both during, and before, the time of actual disputation*. p. 175.

I. Application of this species of testimony to the three several systems of *Calvinism* and *Arminianism* and *Nationalism*. p. 176.—

I. There was no controversy, respecting the alleged Calvinism of the Primitive Church, at the time, when, by Mr. Milner's acknowledgment, it gradually became defunct. p. 176.—(1.) Mr. Milner's attempted solution of the difficulty is unsupported by any evidence whatsoever. p. 177.—(2.) The silence of the second century stands curiously contrasted with the disputativeness of the fifth century. p. 185.—2. The remarks, made upon the absence of all Controversy with respect to Calvinism in the second century, equally apply to a similar absence of all Controversy with respect to Arminianism and Nationalism. If either of these was the System received by the Primitive Church, it expired without either producing controversy or even attracting notice. p. 186.

II. The same remarks will serve to introduce an inquiry into the nature of the aboriginal Scheme of doctrine in regard to Election. p. 188.—1. Anticipatory statement of the result of the inquiry. p. 189. —2. Remarks on that Scheme of doctrine, which, in point both of *Ideality* and of *Causation*, is the most ancient. p. 192.—(1.) Conventional phraseology. p. 192.—(2.) The Church of the Election. p. 193.—(3.) The strictly primitive Scheme of *Causation*. p. 194.

CHAPTER II.

THE IDEALITY OF ELECTION ACCORDING TO THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

The writings of the early Fathers contain sufficient notices, by which we may determine the *Ideality* of Election according to the Primitive Church. p. 195.

I. An adduction of passages, from various ancient writers, for the purpose of satisfactorily determining the present question. p. 195. —1. Clement of Rome. p. 196.—2. Ignatius of Antioch. p. 198. —3. Hermas. p. 199.—4. Polycarp's Smyrnèan Church. p. 201. —5. Justin Martyr. p. 201.—6. Irenèus. p. 202.—7. Clement of Alexandria. p. 205.—8. Cyprian. p. 205.—9. Ambrose. p. 206.—10. Jerome. p. 207.

II. Remarks on the adduced passages. p. 208.—1. The same Scheme of *Ideality* runs through the whole of them. p. 208.— 2. *The Election of the House of Israel collectively*, viewed as a type and exemplar of *The Election of the Christian Church collectively*. p. 211.—3. Some members of the Election are holy individuals, while others are unholy. p. 212.—4. Unholy members of the Election both may and will perish everlastingly. p. 213.

CHAPTER III.

THE CAUSATION OF ELECTION ACCORDING TO THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

A difficulty, as might be expected, was soon felt in regard to the moving *Cause* of Election, in which the Justice of God appeared to be implicated: and it was thought that this difficulty might be removed, by calling in, as its *Cause*, God's undoubted Foreknowledge of man's future actions. p. 215.

I. It has been roundly and repeatedly asserted by writers of the Arminian School: that, *According to* ALL *the ancient Fathers before Augustine, the moving Cause of God's Election was His Foreknowledge of the fitness of certain individuals; so that, from all eternity, he elected such individuals, because he foreknew that they would be devoted to him, and because their foreseen holiness thus made them fit subjects for God's Election.* Yet, after a diligent examination of the then existing ecclesiastical documents, Prosper, writing to Augustine, would only admit: that ALMOST ALL *the preceding Fathers maintained the propriety of that doctrinal solution.* p. 216.

II. The restrictive language of Prosper naturally provokes an inquiry: *Whether the solution before us was coëval with the Christian Church herself;* or *Whether it was excogitated, from a very ancient period indeed, but still not from the beginning.* p. 219.—1. An inquiry into the sentiments of the oldest christian writers, in regard to the moving *Cause* of Election. p. 219.—(1.) According to Clement of Rome and the whole earliest Roman Church with him, the *Cause* of Election is *God's Clemency and Mercy.* p. 219.—(2.) According to Ignatius, who may be viewed as speaking the sentiments of the earliest Church of Antioch, the *Cause* of Election is *The Sovereign Will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God.* p. 220.—(3.) According to Hermas, the *Cause* of Election is *God's own Powerful or Sovereign Virtue.* p. 220.—(4.) According to Justin Martyr, the *Cause* of Election is not *God's Prevision of man's fitness and worthiness.* Whence we cannot but infer, that, according to Justin Martyr, the *Cause* of Election is *God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure.* p. 221.—(5.) According to Irenèus, the *Cause* of Election is *God's own inscrutable Purpose and Wisdom.* p. 224.—2. Thus, of the proposed arminian solution, there is not only not a vestige to be found down to the time of Irenèus who wrote in the year 175: but,

whenever a *Cause* is assigned for Election, that *Cause* invariably is *God's Sovereign Will and Wisdom and Mercy*. At the close of the second century, however, the *Cause*, now advocated by the Arminians, was, for the first time, struck out and propounded by Clement of Alexandria. After the days of Clement, and down to the days of Augustine, this comparatively novel Scheme of *Causation* may be broadly said to have met with something very like universal acceptation: yet, as may be exemplified from the case of Jerome, even during this period, such was the vitality of the most ancient Scheme of *Causation*, we occasionally encounter an appearance either of hesitation or of inconsistency. p. 226.—(1.) The language of Jerome, in more than one place, might well lead us to deem him the unreserved patron of the Scheme of *Causation* invented by Clement of Alexandria. p. 228.—(2.) Yet he sometimes approvingly brings forward the more ancient Scheme: and even specially alleges, that it exhibits the ecclesiastical sense of the words of the Apostle Paul. p. 230.—3. Hence, by the mere force of evidence, I am led to conclude: that the *Cause* of Election, received by the strictly Primitive Church, was, not *God's Foreknowledge of man's future merit*, but *God's Sovereign Will and Wisdom mercifully operating through the alone merits of Christ*. p. 233.—(1.) The primitive Scheme of *Causation* inevitably follows from the primitive Scheme of *Ideality*. p. 233.—(2.) This was soon perceived: and it produced a vain attempt to reconcile the Primitive Scheme of *Ideality* which was still retained, with the novel Scheme of *Causation* which after the time of its inventor Clement rapidly became fashionable. p. 234.

III. The sum of the inquiry, with the conclusion from it. p. 237.—1. In the judgment of the apostolically instructed Church of the two first centuries, the *Cause* of Election was held to be *God's Merciful Sovereignty*. p. 237.—2. From a vain attempt to vindicate God's Justice, a new *Cause* of Election was struck out by Clement of Alexandria about the end of the second century: namely, *God's Foreknowledge of man's future righteousness*. p. 237.—3. Therefore, according to the wise canon of Tertullian, we must reject the novel Scheme of *Causation*, and, with the earliest Church, retain the ancient Scheme. p. 237.

IV. Introduction to future inquiries into the import of the phraseology adopted both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. p. 238.

CHAPTER IV.

THE IDEALITY OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE LAW.

An examination of the phraseology employed under the Law, with respect to the *Ideality* of Election. p. 239.

I. A collection of passages illustrative of the present subject. p. 239.

II. In all these several passages, the Election, spoken of, is, in point of *Ideality*, not *An Election, by an irreversible decree, to eternal life*, but *An Election into a particular Community, which, to the designed purpose of holiness, should be separated from the great mass of the unbelieving nations.* But this *Ideality* of Election is the very same as that received and propounded by the Primitive Church: therefore, in point of *Ideality*, the view of *Election*, taken by the Primitive Church, perfectly corresponds with the doctrine of *Election* as exhibited in the Old Testament. p. 243.

CHAPTER V.

THE CAUSATION OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE LAW.

An examination of the phraseology employed under the Law, with respect to the *Causation* of Election. p. 246.

I. A collection of passages illustrative of the present subject. p. 246.

II. From these passages it appears, that, under the Law, the moving *Cause* of Election was defined to be, not *God's Prevision of the future holiness of the collective Israelites*, but *God's Sovereign Will and Pleasure and Regard to his own great name.* But such also was held to be the moving *Cause* of Election, by the strictly Primitive Church of the two first centuries. Therefore, in point of *Causation*, the view of Election, taken by the strictly Primitive Church, perfectly corresponds with the view of Election as taken in the Old Testament. p. 248.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IDEALITY OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE GOSPEL.

As the phraseology employed under the Gospel is strictly analogous to

the phraseology employed under the Law, we may anticipate, that the *Ideality* of Election will be the same under each Dispensation. p. 249.

I. As a general principle, St. Paul teaches us, that, both under the Law and under the Gospel, the terms *Election* and *Elect* are used in the same sense. p. 249.—1. This we learn from the Epistle to the Romans. Rom. ix. 6–26, 30, 31. x. 19–21. xi. 1, 5, 7. p. 249.—2. What had been anticipated as a presumption, St. Paul here lays down as a fact. p. 251.

II. The *Ideality* of Election, under the Gospel, then, is that of *An Election of individuals into the pale of the visible Church, with God's moral Purpose that through Faith and Holiness they should attain everlasting life, but yet with a moral possibility of their abusing their privileges even to their own final destruction.* p. 253.—1. In accordance with this ascertained *Ideality*, runs universally the tenor of the compellations as the Apostolic Epistle. p. 254.—2. In accordance with this same *Ideality*, whole Churches collectively are styled *Elect.* p. 255.—3. In accordance with this same *Ideality* are framed the two Parables, in which the term *Elect* or *Chosen* first occurs. p. 257.—4. In accordance still with this same *Ideality*, we find the Elect repeatedly spoken of in such a manner, that the term can only designate those persons who have been elected into the Church out of the unbelieving world. p. 258.—5. In accordance, again, with this same *Ideality*, we learn, from various passages, that *The Elect may fall away to eternal ruin.* p. 259.

III. An examination of certain passages commonly adduced as favourable to the Calvinistic System. p. 263.—1. First passage. John vi. 37, 39. p. 264.—(1.) The passage relates only to *God's moral Purpose or Intention.* p. 264.—(2.) Reply to the usual calvinistic answer. p. 265.—2. Second passage. John x. 27–29. p. 266.—3. Third passage. Rom. viii. 28–30. p. 267.—(1.) The professed basis of the calvinistic gloss upon this passage is the word *Glorified.* p. 268.—(2.) The usual arminian reply, being founded upon doctrinal error, is thence unsatisfactory and insufficient. p. 269.—(3.) The true reply rests upon a detection of the false view of the word *Glorified*, which is taken by the Calvinist. p. 270.—4. Fourth passage. Ephes. v. 25–27. p. 272. (1.) Inconclusiveness of the reasoning of the Calvinist from this passage, even on his own principles. p. 272.—(2.) The real meaning of the passage is given well and judiciously even by Augustine himself. p. 273.

IV. Conclusion. p. 274.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CAUSATION OF ELECTION AS PROPOUNDED UNDER THE GOSPEL.

An Inquiry, negative and positive, into the *Causation* of Election, as it is propounded under the Gospel. p. 275.

I. The Inquiry negative. p. 275.

II. The Inquiry positive. p. 276.—1. The reasoning of St. Paul. Rom. xi. 5, 6. p. 277.—2. The declaration of St. Paul. 2 Tim. i. 9. p. 278.—3. The doctrinal sentiment of St. Paul. Ephes. i. 3–11. p. 278.—4. The lengthened reasoning of St. Paul, with his formal meeting of an objection. Rom. ix. 11–21. p. 279.

III. The general result is: that *The strictly primitive doctrine of Election, in point both of Ideality and of Causation, is the precise doctrine authoritatively delivered both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament.* p. 281.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, RESPECTING ELECTION, INVESTIGATED NEGATIVELY.

A negative investigation of *What doctrine, on the topic of Election, the Church of England does not hold.* p. 283.

I. On the part of the Calvinists, their claim of the Church of England is founded upon the Seventeenth Article of that Church. p. 284.—1. Chronology forbids the theory, that *Cranmer, in drawing up the Seventeenth Article, built upon the doctrinal System propounded and controversially maintained by Calvin.* p. 284.—2. The doctrine of the Seventeenth Article was borrowed, not from Calvin's predecessor Augustine, but from Melancthon, who was consulted on the subject by Cranmer and who expressly rejected the fatalising Scheme of Calvin. p. 286.—3. With this conclusion agrees the very texture of the Article itself. p. 290.—4. We have no valid evidence, that the Theological System of Calvin is the Theological System of the Reformed Church of England. p. 294.

II. If we may judge from his apparently studied imitation of the language of the Seventeenth Article, Arminius also may seem to have claimed the suffrage of the Anglican Church. p. 294.—1. The *Causation* of Election, according to Arminius. p. 297.—

2. The Seventeenth Article gives no warrant to any claim, on the part of the Arminians, that the Church of England favours their System. p. 300.—3. We have no valid evidence, that the Theological System of the Anglican Church is the same as the Theological System of Arminius. p. 300.

III. Of that Scheme of *Nationalism*, which makes nations and not individuals the subjects of God's decree of Election, nothing can be discovered in the authorised documents of the Church of England. p. 301.

IV. The general conclusion is, negatively: that *The Church of England upholds neither Calvinism nor Arminianism nor Nationalism.* p. 301.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, RESPECTING ELECTION, INVESTIGATED POSITIVELY.

A positive investigation of *What doctrine, on the topic of Election, the Church of England does hold.* p. 302.

I. The *Ideality* of Election, as maintained and taught by the Church of England. p. 302.—1. The Seventeenth Article. p. 302.—(1.) The doctrine of Melancthon. p. 304.—(2.) An application of the doctrine of Melancthon to the Seventeenth Article. p. 308.—2. The other authorised documents of the English Church. p. 316.—(1.) The harmonising *Ideality* of Election as inculcated in those other documents. p. 319.—(2.) The Elect, as the Church of England understands the term, may fall away finally from Grace given. p. 322.—(3.) With the *Ideality* of Election, maintained by the English Church, the doctrine of *Universal Redemption* is perfectly compatible, and is thence consistently maintained. p. 330.

II. The *Causation* of Election, as held by the Church of England. p. 331.—1. The doctrine of Melancthon. p. 331.—2. From the history of the Seventeenth Article, we may reasonably infer, that the doctrine of Melancthon is the doctrine of the Church of England. p. 332.—(1.) The anglican doctrine of *Causation* may be gathered from the use of the word *freely* in the Seventeenth Article, though the Article itself enters not specifically into the subject. p. 334.—(2.) It may be gathered also from the general analogy of the entire doctrinal System of the English Church in regard to human merit. p. 335.—(3.) It may be yet further

gathered from the very necessity of the Scheme of *Ideality*, which has been adopted by the Church of England. p. 335.—(4.) It may be finally gathered from the circumstance of her employing language, which is utterly irreconcileable with the notion, that the moving *Cause* of Election is *God's Foreknowledge of man's future merit*. p. 336.

CHAPTER X.

THE RATIONALE OR PRINCIPLE OF ECCLESIASTICAL INDIVIDUAL ELECTION.

The *Rationalè* or *Principle* of Scriptural Election, which must be understood as denoting *Ecclesiastical Individual Election*, seems most probably to be the following. The remarkable dispensation in question is, in a manner, *forced* upon God, by the wickedness and perverseness of fallen man: so that, in truth, unless the Deity had ceased to be a moral governor of the universe, and unless he had determined to bind his whole intellectual creation upon earth in the adamantine chain of a Fatal Necessity, matters *could not* well have been otherwise, than what we actually find them to have been and what indeed we may observe them still to be. p. 339.

I. In order to develop this view of the subject, nothing more is necessary than simply to follow the history of man from the beginning. p. 341.

II. The process, through all these periods, is nothing more than the inevitable result of a supreme government at once moral and merciful. p. 343.

III. The same view of the subject was taken of old by several of the ancient ecclesiastical writers: whence we may infer, that it was the ordinary accredited view of the Primitive Church. p. 346.—1. Irenèus. p. 346.—2. Justin Martyr. p. 347.—3. Cyril of Alexandria. p. 348.—4. Augustine. p. 348.—5. Athanasius. p. 349.—6. Theodoret. p. 349.

IV. Conclusion. p. 350.

APPENDIX.

Canones Concilii Arausicani, a Leone Papa, ejus nominis primo, indicti. A. D. 441. p. 353.

DATE DUE

APR 17 1975
APR 28 1976
MAR 2 1977
APR 29 1981
JUL 21 1981
DEC 14 1981
MAY 09 1985
MAY 2 1986
APR 20 1987
MAY 25 1987
JUN 9 1987
MAY 3 1988

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

234.9
F115

Faber, George Stanley
AUTHOR

The primitive doctrine of election
TITLE

234.9
F115 Faber, George Stanley
The primitive doctrine of election.

1077